arXiv:1607.01768v1 [quant-ph] 6 Jul 2016

On the origin of nonclassicality in single systems

S. Aravinda,[1,*] R. Srikanth,[1,†] and Anirban Pathak[2,‡]

[1] *Poornaprajna Institute of Scientific Research, Sadashivnagar, Bengaluru- 560080, India*
[2] *Jaypee Institute of Information Technology, A-10, Sector-62, Noida, UP-201307, India*

Investigating the foundational basis underpinning nonclassicality in an operational theory of single (i.e., monopartite), finite-dimensional systems in the convex framework, we show that many significant nonclassical features of quantum mechanics can be derived from two axioms– (a) Pairwise *incongruence* among m observables, leading to the non-simpliciality of the state space; (b) Prohibition of m-congruence associated with an intransitive or unextendable congruence structure, when $m > 2$.– Axiom (a) suffices to derive a host of nonclassical features, among them, multiple pure-state decomposability, non-comeasurability, measurement disturbance, no-cloning, unconditional cryptographic security as well as (with minor provisos) uncertainty, preparation contextuality and the impossibility of certain coherent operations such as the universal inverter. The major feature not derivable from axiom (a) is Kochen-Specker contextuality, for which axiom (b) is necessary, and which can serve as the basis for a kind of device-independent cryptographic security. Our approach also allows for non-quantum nonclassicality wherein axiom (b) holds without (a) being true, corresponding to higher-order contextual correlations.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that nonclassicality in multipartite systems arises from nonlocal [1] non-signaling correlations [2], an area that has been extensively studied in recent years [3–10]. A major line of research here attempts to understand whether the nonclassical features of quantum mechanics (QM), such as uncertainty, no-cloning, measurement disturbance, non-comeasurability, complementarity, etc., are special to QM, or whether their absence is special to classical mechanics. In particular, various earlier works have linked nonlocality to local nonclassical properties of single systems, such as intrinsic randomness [2], non-comeasurability [11–15], uncertainty [16], local quantum mechanics [17] and non-simpliciality of the state space [7], in the context of *multipartite* systems.

A more elementary issue is: what axioms make a *monopartite* (i.e., single, stand-alone) system quantum mechanical, without any reference to the composition of subsystems and multipartite correlations? Apart from an axiomatic approach to the quantum mechanics of single systems [18], recently a number of works [19–23] have examined the quantum bound on contextuality [24].

In this work, we address a weaker version of the above question: what makes a monopartite system *nonclassical*? Such an approach allows us to propose a simple axiomatic approach that promises to *qualitatively* capture all that is nonclassical about QM. Thus they can provide a basic axiom schematic, which could be hierarchically followed by considerations that produce axioms that derive the exact quantum theory (cf. Refs. [3, 25]). Such an approach gives us a chance to isolate the most elementary surprise about a theory, allowing us to try to go from there to more elaborate features.

Finally, we note that contextuality and nonlocality are closely connected. From one perspective, contextuality generalizes nonlocality. Yet, barring the derivation of the monogamy relation between the CHSH and KCBS inequalities [26], other works linking nonlocality with the features of single systems [2, 11–16] are concerned with only base-level single system features like no-cloning, intrinsic randomness, measurement disturbance and measurement uncertainty, rather than with contextuality. The axioms for nonclassicality can hopefully provide the link between such base-level features and contextuality, thus helping to complete the picture linking local and nonlocal features of nonclassical theories, and thence of QM.

In our approach, we regard a single system as a composite built by aggregating individual *properties*, represented as observables. The basic intuition is that a classical system is one where properties coexist peacefully, whereas in a nonclassical system, there is some sort of "tension" prohibiting their peaceful coexistence. Employing the mathematical tools of convex operational theories [3, 7, 27–32], our work essentially identifies two levels of tension, and hence of nonclassicality.

The lower or base level is derived from the pairwise *measurement incongruence* of observables. Two observables are measurement congruent precisely if they can be simultaneously value-definite. We will find that, for a type of finite-dimensional operational theories that are physically well motivated, pairwise measurement congruence of observables is geometrically realized as the requirement that the associated state space Σ of the single system is a simplex, whereas incongruence entails a deviation from simplicial geometry. Surprisingly, just this assumption of nonsimpliciality will be seen to lead to many major nonclassical features, barring Kochen-Specker (KS) contextuality [24].

The higher level of tension between properties, leading

* aru@poornaprajna.org
† srik@poornaprajna.org
‡ anirban.pathak@jiit.ac.in

to contextuality, comes when measurement congruence fails to be transitive or extendable to higher order. Our geometric characterization of nonclassicality in a natural way suggests a new approach to the ontology of nonclassical theories wherein the ontological model is characterized as an underlying simplex of exponentially larger dimensionality.

In Section II we formulate a convex framework to study monopartite systems, identifying the axiomatic requirement for a theory to be classical (Section II A) or nonclassical (Section II B). Nonclassical properties, which are consequences of the nonsimpliciality assumption, are studied in Section III, among them non-comeasurability (Section III A), measurement disturbance (Section III B), no-cloning (Section III C) and the impossibility of jointly distinguishing all pure states (Section III D). The sense in which uncertainty also follows from nonsimpliciality is explained in Section IV.

Section V explores certain consequences of nonsimpliciality in conjunction with ontological considerations. The concept of an ontological model as a simplex underlying an operational theory is developed in Section V A. This is then applied to derive a result concerning impossible universal operations (V B) and preparation contextuality (V C).

The past Sections deal with "base-level nonclassicality", arising from pairwise incongruence. How this generates a congruence structure which it is insufficient to describe, leading to states that lack a *joint probability distribution* over properties in the theory, and features of "higher-level nonclassicality", is explored in Section VI. Here we develop ideas that allow us to understand how quantum-like contextuality and similar higher-order effects arise from more elementary nonclassical features. Section VII develops the ontological concept of an underlying simplex for contextual correlations, with simulations and further extensions explored in Section VIII.

The distinct cryptographic implications of nonclassical theories at the lower and higher levels of nonclassicality are studied in Section IX. Finally, we conclude in Section X.

II. CONVEX FRAMEWORK FOR MONOPARTITE SYSTEMS

An operational theory $\mathcal{T}$ for monopartite systems is characterized by the state space Σ, the convex set of all possible states associated to a system governed by the theory. The set of extreme points of Σ is denoted $\partial\Sigma$.

A theory $\mathcal{T}$'s *tomographic dimension* D is defined as the number of *fiducial measurements*, or the minimal number of real parameters, required to fully characterize the state of a system. Here it will be convenient to refer to D as simply "dimension".

The minimal set of observables (e.g., $X, Y, Z, \cdots$) whose measurement outcome statistics can encompass all fiducial measurements and thus fully characterize the system, constitutes a *fiducial set of observables*. We shall assume that an operational theory typically concerns m-input-n-output systems, where m is the number of fiducial observables and n the number of outcome possibilities for any observable. By the assumption of *tomographic separability*, a system is completely specified by the probabilities generated by the fiducial obsevables individually. Further, it is assumed that every pure state can be prepared by measuring one or more fiducial observable and postselecting. Thus, every pure state is an "eigenstate" of one or more fiducial observable. Measuring an observable on its eigenstate must reproduce the eigenstate deterministically.

We shall refer to as a *regular theory* one in which any pure state can be characterized, prepared and reproduced by fiducial measurements. Clearly, almost any operational theory of physical interest is regular.

A. Classical theory

A classical theory $\mathcal{T}$ is one where all m fiducial observables $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_m$ of a system are congruent at all orders, i.e., pairs, triples and any m-tuples of observables coexist peacefully. We associate individual state spaces $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \cdots, \Sigma_m$ with the observables, where Σ_j is the convex hull of all possible values x_j. Clearly, Σ_j is a simplex. Peaceful coexistence is identified with the requirement that the state space Σ of the full system is the direct product of the individual convex sets:

$$\Sigma \equiv \Sigma_1 \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_2 \underline{\otimes} \cdots \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_m, \tag{1}$$

defined as the convex hull of the direct product of vertices in the sets Σ_j. Given vertex sets $\partial\Sigma_j \equiv \{x_j\}$, the set of n^m points $\{\psi^{(m)} \equiv x_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_m\}$ constitutes $\partial\Sigma$. It is convenient to refer to operator $\underline{\otimes}$ as the *convex direct product*.

The linear independence of elements x_j in Σ_j implies the linear independence of $\psi^{(m)}$. Therefore, state space Σ, which is the convex hull of the points $\psi^{(m)}$, is a simplex. It is observed that the dimension

$$D = |\partial\Sigma| - 1. \tag{2}$$

Quite generally, we shall identify classicality of a regular theory with the requirement that the associated full state space Σ is a simplex generated by product vertices.

Example. Consider the classical theory $\mathcal{T}$ of two fiducial observables X and Z which take values $x, z \in \{0, 1\}$. In *barycentric coordinates* [33], the basis for both Σ_X and Σ_Z is $\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$. By virtue of peaceful coexistence of these two properties, the full state space $\Sigma_{XZ} \equiv \Sigma_X \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_Z$ and is given as the convex hull of

the points $\{(1,0),(0,1)\}\otimes\{(1,0),(0,1)\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |xz{=}00) &\equiv (1,0,0,0),\\ |xz{=}01) &\equiv (0,1,0,0),\\ |xz{=}10) &\equiv (0,0,1,0),\\ |xz{=}11) &\equiv (0,0,0,1). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The general mixed state is an arbitrary point in Σ_{XZ}, and has the unique barycentric coordinate representation given by (a,b,c,d) with $a+b+c+d=1$ and $a,b,c,d\geq 0$. Dimension $\dim(\Sigma_{XZ})=3$. Thus, Σ_{XZ} can be represented as a 3-simplex (tetrahedron) in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The four points (3) have a Cartesian representation as the *convex independent* points $(0,0,0),(0,1,1),(1,0,1),(1,1,0)$. We note that if even one of Σ_X and Σ_Z isn't a simplex, then nor is Σ_{XZ}. As an illustration, it may be observed that if one replaces Σ_X with the convex hull of the set $\{(0,0),(0,1),(1,0),(1,1)\}$, then Σ_{XZ} is a nonsimplex. ∎

The above consideration, that classicality of regular theories is identified with the simplicial geometry, forms our point of departure to nonclassical theories. We associate nonclassicality with a lack of peaceful coexistence (or, tension) between observables, identified here with a departure from simplicial structure, as discussed below.

B. Nonclassicality

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a nonclassical regular theory characterized by two fiducial incongruent observables X and Z with n-outcomes x and z, respectively. We posit that peaceful coexistence between observables in the sense of congruence of properties has the basic significance that the observables can assume definite values simultaneously. Thus conjunctive propositions ("x and z") can be assigned a definite truth value. Loss of peaceful coexistence through incongruence causes properties to be linked disjunctively (whereby "x xor z" has a definite truth value) even in pure states. For regular theories, this has a geometric consequence, discussed below.

Accordingly, let the n "eigenstates of X", denoted $|\psi_X^j)$, represent the extreme points of the system state space Σ in question, characterized by definite "X-eigenvalue" x_j and indefinite value of Z. Analogously, the n "eigenstates of Z", denoted $|\psi_Z^k)$, represent extreme points of Σ having definite z_k and indefinite value of X. Therefore, the state space Σ is the convex hull of these $|\partial\Sigma|=2n$ pure points.

Any eigenstate of X (resp., Z) can be prepared by measurement of X (resp., Z), followed by postselection. Measuring X on $|\psi_X^j)$ will result in a definite X-outcome (namely, x_j) whereas measuring Z on this state will result in an indefinite z_k outcome governed by a $(n-1)$-dimensional probability distribution. Analogously for Z or X measurements on Z eigenstates. Therefore, the dimension of Σ is $D\equiv 2(n-1)$. The fact that $|\partial\Sigma|>D+1$ means that not all pure states are linearly independent. Therefore, Σ is non-simplicial. We identify this nonsimpliciality as the basic characteristic for nonclassicality in our approach.

In a nonclassical theory of m-input-n-output systems, suppose that the m fiducial observables are pairwise incongruent. Thus, to each fiducial observable we associate a normalized probability distribution of $(n-1)$ free parameters. The system has a dimension of $D=m(n-1)$. Per the earlier argument whereby we associate n pure states with each fiducial observable, there will be $|\partial\Sigma|=mn$ pure states. Thus,

$$|\partial\Sigma|-D=m, \tag{4}$$

from which the nonsimplicality of Σ follows, for $m>1$.

The above idea, that incongruence causes properties that are conjunctively connected to become disjunctively linked, is reflected mathematically in the fact that the tensor product structure (1) is replaced by one with tensor *sum*:

$$\Sigma=\Sigma_1\oplus\Sigma_2\oplus\cdots\oplus\Sigma_m, \tag{5}$$

which is not a simplex, since its dimension scales multiplicatively, while the number of pure states increases exponentionally, as noted above.

We shall refer to the relations between the elements of $\partial\Sigma$, that leads to their linear dependence and hence to the non-simpliciality of Σ, as the "nonsimpliciality conditions". Typically, such a condition takes the form:

$$\sum_j q_j|\psi_X^j)=\sum_k r_k|\psi_Z^k), \tag{6}$$

with $\sum_j q_j=\sum_k r_k=1$, i.e., in terms of equality of certain X-mixtures and Z-mixtures, and so on. Eq. (6) has the interpretation that two mixtures on the LHS and RHS are operationally indistinguishable. Thus, the nonsimplicality conditions have the operational meaning of multiple pure-state decompositions. Clearly, in a regular theory of m-input-n-output systems, there can be at most $(m-1)$ independent nonsimpliciality conditions.

Example. In the two-input-two-output operational theory $\mathcal{T}$, with two dichotomic observables X and Z, suppose the X- and Z-eigenstates, which are the pure states of space Σ, are:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_X^+ &\equiv (1,0\mid \tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2})\\ \psi_X^- &\equiv (0,1\mid \tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2})\\ \psi_Z^+ &\equiv (\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2}\mid 1,0)\\ \psi_Z^- &\equiv (\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2}\mid 0,1), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the vertical bar separates the measurement probabilities of the fiducial observables X and Z. The nonsimpliciality condition is:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\psi_X^+ + \psi_X^-)=\frac{1}{2}(\psi_Z^+ + \psi_Z^-)=(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\mid\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}). \tag{8}$$

The number of pure points is $|\partial\Sigma_{XZ}| = 4$ whilst the dimension is 2, entailing nonsimpliciality. Clearly, in this case $\Sigma \neq \Sigma_X \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_Z$. ∎

We stress that nonsimpliciality does not imply the non-existence of *joint probability distribution* (JD) in an underlying outcome-deterministic theory. For instance, for each state (7), a JD manifestly exists for X and Z. For example, corresponding to the state $|\psi_X^+\rangle$, we have the separable form $P(x,z|X,Z) = P(x|X)P(z|Z)$, where $P(x|X) = (1,0)$ and $P(z|Z) = (\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$. And so on for the other three pure states.

Indeed, for $m = 2$, one can always find a JD. In Section VI, we shall find that only incongruence with a specific structure gives rise to absence of JD. In Section III, we will explore a number of nonclassical consequences of nonsimpliciality in regular theories.

III. CONSEQUENCES OF NONSIMPLICIALITY

If a regular theory $\mathcal{T}$ has two or more incongruent observables, then the space Σ characterizing the theory is not a simplex, as noted. Interestingly, a number of nonclassical features follow from the nonsimpliciality of Σ, as discussed in the following subsections.

A. Co-measurability

Two observables X and Z each with n measurement outcomes are jointly measurable (or, co-measurable) if there exists a joint observable M_{XZ} such that the statistics of X and Z measurements are obtained under marginalization: $M_X(x|\psi) = \sum_z M_{XZ}(x,z|\psi)$ and $M_Z(z|\psi) = \sum_x M_{XZ}(x,z|\psi)$ for any state $\psi \in \Sigma_{XZ}$ [34]. In the classical world, all observables are jointly measurable trivially. Co-measurability roughly corresponds to the commutativity of operators in the Hilbert space formulation of quantum mechanics.

Now consider a nonclassical theory with $m = 2$ fiducial observables, denoted X and Z. They are taken to be *sharp* in the sense that there are states (namely, the eigenstates) for which the observables take definite values. If these two are jointly measurable, then there are $(n^2-1)\times|\partial\Sigma|$ independent terms $M_{XZ}(x,z|\psi)$ that constitute the putative joint operator, considering each of the possible $|\partial\Sigma|$ pure states ψ. There are $2(n-1)\times|\partial\Sigma|$ independent constraints on them due to the requirement that M_X and M_Z statistics should be reproduced under marginalization.

A nonsimplicality condition, which is of the type Eq. (6), implies additional (n^2-1) independent constraints of the type $\sum_j q_j M(x,z|\psi_j) = \sum_k r_k M(x,z|\psi_k)$, which express the idea that the joint measurement cannot be used to distinguish between the mixtures in the LHS and RHS of (6). These constraints overconstrain M and thus prohibit joint measurability only if $2(n-1)|\partial\Sigma| + n^2 - 1 > (n^2-1)|\partial\Sigma|$, or

$$|\partial\Sigma| \leq \frac{n+1}{n-1} \leq 3, \tag{9}$$

for $n \geq 2$. Clearly, this can never happen for a realistic theory. Therefore, nonsimpliciality by itself does not imply lack of joint measurability. However, for reasons explained, we are only interested in regular theories, and the consequences of nonsimpliciality in them. In this case, the relationship between simplciality of Σ and joint measurability is tight, as shown below.

Definition. In a regular theory, the *associated state space* Σ_{XZ} of two sharp observables X and Z is the convex hull of the eigenstates of X and Z. ∎

Obviously, $\Sigma_{XZ} \subseteq \Sigma$. If Σ is a simplex, then there can be no indistinguishable mixtures of X- and Z-eigenstates, and therefore Σ_{XZ} is also a simplex. Geometrically, this reflects the fact that every m-face of a n-simplex ($m \leq n$) is also a simplex. On the other hand, the converse is not true: if Σ_{XZ} is a simplex, then Σ is not necessarily a simplex. An extreme example is that of Σ which is a simplicial complex formed by gluing together simplexes like Σ_{XZ}.

Theorem 1 *Any pair of observables X and Z in a regular theory are pairwise co-measurable iff their associated state space Σ_{XZ} is a simplex.*

Proof. "Only if" direction: Let the putative joint observable be denoted M. Let the "eigenvalues" of X and Z be x and z taking values from 1 to n. The following argument holds for any one of the $2n$ these eigenstates. Without loss of generality, let ψ be the eigenstate of X associated with eigenvalue $x = 1$. The M_X marginalization constraints require that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(1,1|\psi) + M(1,2|\psi) + \cdots + M(1,n|\psi) = 1\\
&M(2,1|\psi) + M(2,2|\psi) + \cdots + M(2,n|\psi) = 0\\
&\qquad\vdots\\
&M(n,1|\psi) + M(n,2|\psi) + \cdots + M(n,n|\psi) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The M_Z marginalization constraints require that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(1,1|\psi) + M(2,1|\psi) + \cdots + M(n,1|\psi) = p_1\\
&M(1,2|\psi) + M(2,2|\psi) + \cdots + M(n,2|\psi) = p_2\\
&\qquad\vdots\\
&M(1,n|\psi) + M(2,n|\psi) + \cdots + M(n,n|\psi) = \overline{p},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\overline{p} \equiv 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} p_j$. Thus, clearly, the $(n-1)$ independent numbers p_j completely fix the action of the joint operator M on any given ψ. Repeating this argument for each of the $2n$ pure states generating Σ_{XZ}, we see that such a unique joint operator can be constructed.

Therefore, the further n^2-1 independent constraints due to the nonsimpliciality conditions of the type (8) overdetermine the elements of M, prohibiting the existence of the joint observable.

The "if" direction: Intuitively, the challenge to comeasurability happens inside Σ_{XZ} rather than outside. Now, if Σ_{XZ} is a simplex, then the above operator M can be constructed uniquely with regard to M's action on the states in Σ_{XZ}. Consider pure states outside this space, of which there are $|\partial\Sigma| - |\partial\Sigma_{XZ}|$, and which are eigenstates of neither X nor Z.

Assume for simplicity that all systems have $m+2$ inputs (including X and Z) and n outputs. Then, $|\partial\Sigma| - |\partial\Sigma_{XZ}| = mn$ and there are $(n^2-1)\times mn$ free variables, whereas the number of constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} c &= 2(n-1)\times mn + (n^2-1)\times\nu && \text{(12a)}\\ &\leq m(n-1)(3n+1) - (n^2-1), && \text{(12b)}\end{aligned}$$

where the first term in the RHS of Eq. (12a) is due to the marginalizations and $\nu \leq m-1$ is the number of nonsimpliciality conditions of the type (6) in a regular theory. On the number hand, the number of free variables of the type $M_{P,Q}(p,q|\psi)$ given pure state ψ, is

$$\begin{aligned} v &= (n^2-1)\times mn \\ &= m(n-1)(n+1)n, && \text{(13)}\end{aligned}$$

Inasmuch as $c < v$ for $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2$, it follows that M does not get overconstrained. ∎

In regard to the above proof, for completeness, we may consider the case $m > 2$, where one can extend the above argument in a straightforward if elaborate way. This is presented in the Appendix A.

Consider the 2-input-2-output case. Comeasurability of X and Z in the classical case is obvious. We illustrate non-comeasurability in a nonclassical theory.

Example. Consider two observables X and Z, taking values ±1, in a 2-dimensional nonclassical theory, whose extreme states are:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_X^+) &\equiv (1,0 \mid 0.25, 0.75) && \text{(14a)}\\ |\psi_X^-) &\equiv (0,1 \mid 0.75, 0.25) && \text{(14b)}\\ |\psi_Z^+) &\equiv (0.25, 0.75 \mid 1,0) && \text{(14c)}\\ |\psi_Z^-) &\equiv (0.75, 0.25 \mid 0,1). && \text{(14d)}\end{aligned}$$

That the state space Σ_{XZ} obtained as the convex hull of the state in (14) is not a simplex is seen by noting that

$$\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_X^+) + |\psi_X^-)) = \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_Z^+) + |\psi_Z^-)). \qquad (15)$$

To see that we cannot write down a joint observable M_{XZ}, assume contrariwise that such M_{XZ} exists. To get the right marginalized statistics for $|\psi_X^+)$, we require:

$$\begin{aligned} &M_{XZ}(+,+|\psi_X^+) + M_{XZ}(+,-|\psi_X^+) = 1\\ &M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_X^+) + M_{XZ}(-,-|\psi_X^+) = 0\\ &M_{XZ}(+,+|\psi_X^+) + M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_X^+) = 0.25\\ &M_{XZ}(+,-|\psi_X^+) + M_{XZ}(-,-|\psi_X^+) = 0.75. \qquad (16)\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that only $M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_X^+) = M_{XZ}(-,-|\psi_X^+) = 0$ whereas $M_{XZ}(+,+|\psi_X^+) = 0.25$ and $M_{CS}(-,-|\psi_X^+) = 0.75$.

Proceeding thus, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} &M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_X^+) = 0; \qquad M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_Z^-) = 0\\ &M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_X^-) = \frac{1}{4}; \qquad M_{XZ}(-,+|\psi_Z^+) = \frac{3}{4}. \qquad (17)\end{aligned}$$

To satisfy the non-simpliciality condition, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} &M_{XZ}\left(j,k\left|\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_X^+) + |\psi_X^-))\right.\right) =\\ &\quad M_{XZ}\left(j,k\left|\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_Z^+) + |\psi_Z^-))\right.\right), \qquad (18)\end{aligned}$$

which evidently is impossible, as seen for example, setting $(j,k) \equiv (-1,+1)$, since the LHS yields 0.25/2, whereas the RHS yields 0.75/2. ∎

It is important to stress that lack of comeasurability does not imply an absence of JD in an underlying outcome-deterministic theory. For example, the states (14) have manifestly a separable (indeed, product) form $P(x,z|X,Z) = P(x|X)P(z|Z)$.

B. Measurement disturbance

Measurement disturbance between two observables refers to the possible random disturbance of a state produced by the measurement of an observable. We say that X and Z are mutually disturbing if an X-eigenstate under Z-measurement yields a convex mixture of Z-eigenstates and vice versa.

Intuitively, the nonsimpliciality conditions and disturbance are closely connected. If there is no measurement disturbance, all observables can be measured (infinitely many times if required) without modifying the system, and all pure states can be distinguished. Thus, there would be no indistinguishable mixtures of the type $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i\psi_i = \sum_{j=1}^n q_j\phi_j$, and thus no nonsimpliciality conditions. We express this idea formally as following theorem. We observe that without the nonsimplicial conditions, and thereby the lack of corresponding measurement disturbance, the uncertainty of measuring an observable on a non-eigenstate would be akin to the classical probability, e.g., the color of picked balls in a Polya urn [35].

Theorem 2 *Any pair of observables X and Z in a regular theory are mutually non-disturbing iff their associated state space Σ_{XZ} is a simplex.*

Proof. Consider regular theory $\mathcal{T}$ with two fiducial noncomeasurable observables, X and Z. Suppose that X and Z do not produce measurement disturbance for each other. Then for any state in Σ_{XZ}, we can perform M_X,

and later M_Z on the undisturbed state and thereby construct the joint measurement as per the prescription

$$M_{XZ}|\psi) \equiv M_X(\psi)M_Z(\psi), \tag{19}$$

from which simpliciality follows per Theorem 1. Conversely, if Σ_{XZ} is a simplex, then by Theorem 1, observables X and Z are co-measurable. In particular, this means that an unknown state in Σ_{XZ} can be determined deterministically, making the joint measurement effectively non-disturbing. ∎

It is not ruled out that there may be states in Σ and outside Σ_{XZ} that one or both may disturb, even if X and Z are mutually non-disturbing. The following example illustrates how measurement disturbance enforces the indistinguishability of mixtures that are operationally equivalent by virtue of the nonsimpliciality conditions.

Example. Suppose Alice prepares (from Bob's perspective) the unbiased X-mixture $\rho \equiv \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_X^+) + |\psi_X^-))$, where the states $|\psi_X^\pm)$ are as defined in Eq. (14). This mixture is operationally indistinguishable from the unbiased Z-mixture. Under measurement of X, the unbiased X-mixture returns ± 1 with equal probability and leaves the actual state, and hence the mixture, undisturbed.

If Z is measured, then per (14), both Z values are equiprobable, while the state after disturbance is:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{4}|\psi_Z^-) + \frac{3}{4}|\psi_Z^+)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{3}{4}|\psi_Z^-) + \frac{1}{4}|\psi_Z^+)\right) = \rho, \tag{20}$$

meaning that the same mixture is returned. Any POVM in this theory (tossing a loaded coin and measuring X or Z according to the coin's outcome) also does not help in distinguishing the two mixtures . ∎

In general, the measurement disturbance entailed by nonsimpliciality is not unique. Any prescription for the post-measurement probability distribution that preserves this indistinguishability is admissible.

C. No-cloning

Cloning is an operation by which, given an unknown pure state ψ in a state space, at least two copies of ψ are produced. We have the following result.

Theorem 3 *An unknown pure state in the state space Σ_{XZ} associated with a pair of observables X and Z in a regular theory is clonable iff Σ_{XZ} is a simplex.*

Proof. First, we establish the equivalence of measurement disturbance and no-cloning. Suppose in theory $\mathcal{T}$, observables X and Z do not disturb each other. Then each observable can be measured (repeatedly if required) without disturbing any other. From the resulting classical record, the state of the system is completely determined thus cloned.

For the other direction, we suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ permits perfect cloning of an unknown pure state $|\psi) \in \Sigma_{XZ}$. The cloning operation can be used to prepare multiple copies of the same state on any number (say t) of other single systems. Now, suppose that $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_t$ represent measurement trials of a fixed observable (say X) on t clones so made. Thus, X_j represent independent and identically distributed random variables each of which takes n discrete values corresponding to the outcomes.

Let the n frequencies f_j obtained by the t trials be represented by the n-dimensional vector $\vec{f}$. Let ϵ be a constant in the range $[0, 1]$. We use the notation $|\vec{a}|$ to denote the vector of component-wise absolute values and the expression $\vec{a} \geq \vec{b}$ to denote the event that for each component j, $a_j \geq b_j$.

Since the X_j's are independent and identically distributed, the following bound can be shown to hold for the t trials:

$$\Pr\left(\left|\vec{f} - \vec{\mu}\right| \geq \epsilon\vec{\mu}\right) \leq 2\exp\left[\frac{-\epsilon^2 t}{3n}\right], \tag{21}$$

which implies that for large number of trials t, each observed frequency f_j converges exponentially fast towards the probability μ_j.

To prove (21), let $X = \sum_{j=1}^t X_j$ and $\overline{X} \equiv X/t$, where $X_j \in [0, 1]$. By the two-sided Chernoff bound [36],

$$\Pr\left(|\overline{X} - \mu| \geq \epsilon\mu\right) \leq 2\exp\left[\frac{-\epsilon^2 \mu t}{2+\epsilon}\right], \tag{22}$$

where μ is the theoretical mean. Now divide t into n equal segments. On the kth segment, define the coarse-grained observable given by the binary measurement $X^{(k)}$ which takes the value 1 if $X^{(k)} = x_k$, and 0 otherwise. Therefore the kth segment involves t/n trials of random variable $X_j^{(k)} \in \{0, 1\}$ with probabilities $\{\mu_k, 1 - \mu_k\}$.

Applying the Chernoff bound (22) to each segment, we can bound $\Pr(|\overline{X^{(k)}} - \mu_k| \geq \epsilon\mu_k)$ by the right hand side of (22) with the substitutions $t \to t/n$ and $\mu \to \mu_k$. The conjunction of these n events is the LHS of (21), and the product of these segmental bounds is the RHS of (21), where for simplicity, we have replaced the denominator $2 + \epsilon$ by 3 for the considered range $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

For a sufficiently large number of clones, we can perform a tomography of either observable according to Eq. (21) by measuring sufficiently many clones. In this way, the probability vector associated with each observable can be determined to reconstruct $|\psi)$ in Σ_{XZ}.

This establishes the equivalence of disturbance and no-cloning, which establishes the present theorem in view of Theorem 2. ∎

Refs. [2, 3, 7] derive a no-cloning theorem for general probabilistic theories more general than QM in the context of *multipartite* systems subject to the no-signaling condition.

D. Joint distinguishability

States ψ are jointly distinguishable if there is measurement that uniquely identifies the individual states. The *measurement dimension* N is the number of pure states that can be distinguished jointly, i.e., by a one-shot measurement by measuring one or more fiducial observables jointly. Classical intuition suggests $D + 1 = N$, where the $+1$ in the LHS is due to normalization. In a general nonclassical theory, the tomographic and measurement dimensions do not match and we have:

$$N \leq D + 1, \tag{23}$$

allowing for the possibility that not all pure states are jointly distinguishable.

Theorem 4 *All pure states in the state space Σ_{XZ} associated with a pair of observables X and Z in a regular theory are jointly distinguishable iff Σ_{XZ} is a simplex.*

Proof. If Σ_{XZ} is a simplex, then by Theorem 2, X and Z are mutually nondisturbing. Therefore, by sufficiently large number of repetitions (and application of the Chernoff bound), any given pure state in Σ_{XZ} can be uniquely identified. The entire repetitive process should be considered as a one-shot procedure.

To prove the converse: let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the procedure to jointly distinguish all pure states in the state space Σ_{XZ} and $\mathcal{Q}$ be a *classical* cloner that can prepare multiple copies of a *known* state in Σ_{XZ}. Then, clearly $\mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{P}$ can clone any unknown pure state in Σ_{XZ}, which per Theorem 3 entails the simpliciality of Σ_{XZ}. ∎

Theorem 4 implies that for a regular theory, a simplicial space Σ is necessarily the convex hull of jointly distinguishable states, and the vertices of a nonsimplicial space necessarily lack joint distinguishability. Given regularity, indistinguishability has a purely geometric origin. A theory with Σ given as the simplex of states that are *not* jointly distinguishable must have some other mechanism for preventing joint distinguishment, and would not be regular.

IV. MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY AND NONSIMPLICIALITY

Measurement uncertainty refers to the property that two (or more) observables cannot simultaneously take definite values, as revealed by a measurement. Our definition of a nonclassical regular theory presumes uncertainty. In this Section, we shall physically motivate that assumption by showing that a theory with nonsimplicial state space equipped with pure state preparability will necessarily contain measurement uncertainty.

A. Uncertainty measure

It is convenient to quantify (measurement) uncertainty in a theory for any two variables X and Z, with respective outcomes x and z, as follows:

$$\mathcal{U} = \max_{\psi} \left[1 - \left(\max_{x,z} \left[\frac{p(x|X,\psi) + p(z|Z,\psi)}{2} \right] \right) \right], \tag{24}$$

where ψ runs over all states of the theory (cf. [16]). It is straightforward to generalize definition (24) to m (≥ 2) observables, essentially by maximizing the average of the m outcome probabilities over all m-outcome strings.

For the classical theory, $\mathcal{U} = 0$ for any two properties X and Z. For the regular nonclassical theories characterized by states (14) and (7), we find $\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{8}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{4}$, respectively.

A theory with uncertainty need not have nonsimplicial state space. This is because the space Σ may be the convex hull of linearly independent vertices having uncertainty in the sense of definition (24). An instance of such a theory is the one whose state space Σ is the convex hull of four linearly independent states:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1) &\equiv (1, 0 \mid 1, 0) \\ |\psi_2) &\equiv (1, 0 \mid p, \overline{p}) \\ |\psi_3) &\equiv (p, \overline{p} \mid 1, 0) \\ |\psi_4) &\equiv (p, \overline{p} \mid p, \overline{p}), \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\overline{p} = 1 - p$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Thus, Σ is a simplex. Such a theory has none of the no-go theorems proven in the previous section, and hence the uncertainty in such a theory should properly be regarded as due to classical ignorance. Such a "Polya urn theory" is really a classical theory with some measurement or observation limitations.

B. Gdit theories

While uncertainty does not imply nonsimpliciality, conversely nonsimpliciality too does not entail uncertainty. A *gdit theory* (gdit for "generalized dit") is one with nonsimplicial space Σ and $\mathcal{U} = 0$. The pure state in a m-input-n-output gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_G$ is one of n^m *boxes* represented by an m-ary vector $(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m)$, where $x_j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Measuring observable X_j returns x_j deterministically. An arbitrary mixed state is described by m probability distributions with n outcomes, so that the tomographic dimension of the states space Σ_G is $m(n-1)$. Therefore, there are exponentially many relations between the pure states, rendering them linearly non-independent and thereby making Σ_G nonsimplicial. As proven below later, a gdit theory is not regular, because it lacks pure state preparability.

The simplest gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_G^{2,2}$ is the 2-dimensional theory, given by the deterministic version of Eq. (7). The

space $\Sigma_G^{2,2}$ is the convex hull of

$$\begin{aligned} |g_0) &\equiv (0,0) \equiv (1,0 \mid 1,0) \\ |g_1) &\equiv (1,0) \equiv (0,1 \mid 1,0) \\ |g_2) &\equiv (0,1) \equiv (1,0 \mid 0,1) \\ |g_3) &\equiv (1,1) \equiv (0,1 \mid 0,1). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

This satisfies the condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(|g_0) + |g_3)) &= \frac{1}{2}(|g_1) + |g_2)) \\ &= (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

which, in our framework, means that the mixtures on the LHS and RHS of (27) are indistinguishable.

C. Symmetric and asymmetric gdit theories

In a *symmetric gdit* theory, the prescription for measurement disturbance is that when one of the m observables is measured, then the definite value of the measured observable remains the same but the value assignments to the unmeasured $m-1$ observables will be equi-probably distributed:

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots, x_m) \xrightarrow{X_i} d^{1-m} \times \\ \sum_{x'_j \neq x_i} (x'_1, x'_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots, x'_m) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

This corresponds to the concept of a mutually unbiased basis in quantum mechanics. For example, for the states in (26)

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\begin{matrix} |g_0) \\ |g_2) \end{matrix}\right\} &\xrightarrow{X} \frac{1}{2}(|g_0) + |g_2)), \\ \left.\begin{matrix} |g_1) \\ |g_3) \end{matrix}\right\} &\xrightarrow{X} \frac{1}{2}(|g_1) + |g_3)), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

whereby the X value is unaltered whilst the Z value is irreversibly replaced by a uniform distribution. This measurement disturbance in the pattern of the measurement *uncertainty* for states $\psi_X^{\pm}$ in Eq. (7).

In an *asymmetric gdit* theory, the prescription for measurement disturbance is similar, except that the post-measurement distribution of values of the unmeasured observables is not necessarily uniform:

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots, x_m) \xrightarrow{X_i} \sum_{x'_j, j \neq i} p_{x'_1, \cdots, x'_{i-1}, x'_{i+1}, \cdots, x'_m} \\ \times (x'_1, x'_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots, x'_m), \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\sum_{x'_j, j \neq i} p_{x'_1, x'_2, \cdots, x'_{i-1}, x'_{x+1}, \cdots, x'_m} = 1$. Such asymmetric disturbance can be shown to leave equivalent mixtures of pure states indistinguishable, as in the symmetric gdit theory.

For example, for the states in (26) an asymmetric prescription for disturbance could be:

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\begin{matrix} |g_0) \\ |g_2) \end{matrix}\right\} &\xrightarrow{X} \frac{1}{4}|g_0) + \frac{3}{4}|g_2), \\ \left.\begin{matrix} |g_1) \\ |g_3) \end{matrix}\right\} &\xrightarrow{X} \frac{1}{4}|g_3) + \frac{3}{4}|g_1), \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

which replaces the symmetric disturbance in (29). Here the X value is unaltered $X = \pm 1$, respectively) whilst the Z value is distributed in the pattern of the *uncertainty* for states $|\psi_X^{\pm})$ in Eq. (14). The following result shows that the nonsimpliciality conditions do not uniquely fix the disturbance.

Generalizing the above argument, in a symmetric or asymmetric m-input-n-output gdit theory, the measurement disturbance ensures that the indistinguishability implied by the nonsimpliciality conditions is preserved. To see this, suppose that the nonsimpliciality condition in the gdit theory has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}[(0,0,x_3,x_4,\cdots) + (1,1,x_3,x_4,\cdots)] \\ = \frac{1}{2}[(0,1,x_3,x_4,\cdots) + (1,0,x_3,x_4,\cdots)], \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where x_j $(j = 1, 2, \cdots)$ are outcomes that would be obtained when observable X_j is measured. Given the two mixtures represented by the LHS and RHS of (32), suppose X_1 is measured. Then the post-measurement mixture due to the first (resp., second) term in the LHS and the first (resp., second) term in the RHS will be the same. Thus, the post-measurement mixture is the same for both initial states. Now, if X_2 is measured, then the post-measurement mixture due to the first (resp., second) term in the LHS and the second (resp., first) term in the RHS will be the same. Clearly, similar arguments can be given for all other X_j's. It is straightforward to generalize the above argument from bits to dits, and to relations between pure states more elaborate than Eq. (32).

An insight that emerges from noting the joint measurability in an arbitrary nonclassical theory vs the non-comeasurability in a regular nonclassical theory (Section III A) is that the idempotency of the marginal distribution helps "kill" degrees of freedom in the joint observable, facilitating non-comeasurability. By that yardstick, a gdit theory, in which all pure states marginals are idempotent, should readily lack joint measurability. This is indeed the case, as the following example shows.

Example. Consider the 2-input-n-output gdit theory. Proceeding along the lines of Eq. (10), it is readily observed that the joint observable should, if it exists, have the form $M(j,k|(r,s)) = \delta_r^j \delta_s^k$. Now a particular nonsimpliciality condition is:

$$\frac{1}{2}((j,k) + (j',k')) = \frac{1}{2}((j,k') + (j',k)), \tag{33}$$

where $j \neq j'$ and $k \neq k'$. For any state, Eq. (33) constrains the joint observable $M(a, b|\psi)$ such that:

$$M(j,k|\psi)+M(j',k'|\psi) = M(j,k'|\psi)+M(j',k|\psi). \quad (34)$$

Suppose such a joint operator $M(a, b|\psi)$ exists. Let $\psi = (j, k)$. In Eq. (34), of the four terms, the first is 1, while the remaining vanish, implying that the equation cannot be satisfied. It is easy to extend this argument to an arbitrary m-input-n-output gdit theory. Therefore, no joint observable exists for gdit theory. ∎

A gdit theory lacks preparability. For any state, there is no measurement that leaves it undisturbed. Therefore, a pure state in a gdit theory can never be prepared, and state preparations are always *ambiguous*. This is in contrast to a regular theory, pure states are "eigenstates" of some observable and can be be prepared by measurement of that observable followed by postselection. It turns out that the preparation ambiguity in a gdit theory can be matched to the uncertainty of a regular theory, as discussed below.

D. Uncertainty-disturbance correspondence

An m-input-n-output (symmetric or asymmetric) gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_G$, characterized by a disturbance probability distribution $p_{x'_1,x'_2,\cdots,x'_{i-1},x'_{i+1},\cdots,x'_m}$ given in (30) under measurement of X_i is said to *correspond* to a m-input-n-output regular theory $\mathcal{T}_U$, if the pure state with definite value $X_i = x_i$ is given by

$$|X_i = x_i)_U = \sum_{x'_j \neq x_i} p_{x'_1,,\cdots,x'_{i-1},x'_{i+1},\cdots,x'_m} \times (x'_1, x'_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots, x'_m)_G, \quad (35)$$

where the paranthesized term with subscript G is a gdit state. This point was already noted in connection with Eqs. (29) and (31).

The number of pure states in theory $\mathcal{T}_G$ is n^m while it is mn in the corresponding regular theory $\mathcal{T}_U$. On the other hand, both have the same dimension $m(n-1)$, which implies that $\mathcal{T}_G$ will have exponentially more number of nonsimplicial conditions. To determine the nonsimpliciality conditions in $\mathcal{T}_U$ starting from those in $\mathcal{T}_G$, we measure the LHS and RHS of a gdit nonsimpliciality conditions in the same observable, and re-interpret the resulting measurement-disturbed states as pure states with uncertainty in the regular theory obtained using the above $\mathcal{T}_G - \mathcal{T}_U$ correspondence.

For example, to get from Eq. (27) to (15), we measure the LHS of (27) by X, which effects according to the above recipe:

$$|g_0) \to |\psi^+_X); \qquad |g_3) \to |\psi^-_X),$$

and we measure RHS of (27) by Z, which effects:

$$|g_1) \to |\psi^+_Z); \qquad |g_2) \to |\psi^-_Z),$$

from which (15). The gdit and the corresponding regular theories have the same observables, though the states that lack measurement uncertainty are different.

Interestingly, a gdit theory and its corresponding regular theory are *operationally indistinguishable* in our framework, essentially because of the interplay of disturbance and uncertainty, as discussed below.

For our purpose, a theory with tomographic separability can be fully characterized at the operational level in two steps: (1) State preparation: measuring fiducial observable A and post-selecting on outcome a; (2) Measurement: determining the outcome probabilities of a subsequent measurement $B \neq A$ of other observables. If $B = A$, then the outcome is always assumed a (i.e., repeatability assumed).

Suppose we have two theories $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$, and two n-dimensional observables X and Z in $\mathcal{T}_1$, and their analogues in $\mathcal{T}_2$, also referred to as X and Z. In either theory, we can prepare a state by measuring one of the observables (say X) and post-selecting on a particular outcome. If a subsequent measurement of the other observable (say Z) yields the same outcome probabilities, and this holds true for every preparation in $\mathcal{T}_1$ and its analogous preparation in $\mathcal{T}_2$, then $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are operationally indistinguishable. An observer cannot determine whether $\mathcal{T}_1$ or $\mathcal{T}_2$ is applicable in the operational world.

Note that in a gdit theory, because of preparation ambiguity, the first step above does not produce an unambiguous pure state. For example, suppose that in the 2-input-2-output gdit theory, Alice needs to prepare $(X = 0, Z = 0)$. If she measures X on an unknown state and postselects on 0, Z remains indeterminate. A subsequent measurement on Z disturbs X. This ambiguity in preparation mimics the measurement uncertainty of the corresponding regular theory, as the following result shows.

Theorem 5 *A gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_G$ and its corresponding regular theory $\mathcal{T}_U$ are operationally indistinguishable from each other.*

Proof. Let us consider a gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_G$ of two observables X and Z (with straightforward generalization to more observables). Without loss of generality, suppose we first prepare $X = x$ during the state preparation step. In the gdit theory, if the state preceding measurement was such that $X \neq x$, then it will be "post-rejected", i.e., post-selected out. Thus, a post-selected state necessarily pre-possessed definite value $X = x$. Therefore, no matter what the unknown pure state preceding the measurement, the post-selected state under the subsequent measurement of Z will reflect the same disturbance probability $p_X(z)$, which will be $\frac{1}{d}$ in a symmetric gdit theory.

By definition of the corresponding regular theory, the preparation step above will produce the unique regular state $|X = x)$, whose uncertainty probability distribution will be $p_X(z)$. A Z measurement in step (2) will thus



FIG. 1. The state space of the two-input-two-put gdit theory is the outer square. The inner square (resp., circular disk) is the regular theory corresponding to the symmetric (resp., assymmetric) gdit theory. The pairs (X, Z) and (A, B) represent equivalent fiducial observables, connected by a continuous rotation. From the perspective of Σ-ontology (cf. Section V C), the gdit theory is intermediate ontological space $\Sigma_\cup$ underlying the operational (regular) theory Σ, which can be the inner square or the circle.

give the outcome statistics for the gdit theory and its corresponding regular theory. ∎

The ability of observers to prepare any pure state is obviously a nice feature and hence an important requirement for any operational theory. Requiring preparability is the reason that a nonclassical regular theory has $\mathcal{U} > 0$. This justifies our inclusion of uncertainty as a basic feature of regularity in Section II.

The uncertainty-disturbance shows that the regular theory corresponding to a gdit theory can be considered as having an *epistemic interpretation* over ontic states supplied by the gdit theory. This observation generalizes to Spekkens' model for an epistemic model [25], discussed later below.

In Figure 1, the outer square represents a two-input-two-output gdit theory, with the two fiducial observables being X and Z. The inner square is the regular theory corresponding to the symmetric gdit theory. The circular disk represents a more general regular theory, with infinitely many pure states (circular rim), generated by the gdit theory considering a continuum of asymmetric measurement disturbances. The antipodal points of the circle will represent eigenstates of rotated fiducial observables A and B, obtained under suitable continuous transformation of X and Z.

V. NONSIMPLICALITY: ONTOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The preceding consequences of nonsimpliciality follow from purely operational considerations. In this Section, we take up certain ontological issues.

A. Underlying simplex and Σ-ontology

The idea that an ontological model for a nonclassical theory is itself a classical theory of some kind suggests an *underlying simplex* $\Sigma_\sqcup$ and a corresponding *underlying classical theory* $\mathcal{T}_\sqcup$ as natural representations of an ontological model. Given fiducial observables $X, Y, Z, \cdots$ in $\mathcal{T}$, we posit underlying versions of these observables, which will also be referred to as $X, Y, Z, \cdots$. However, unlike in $\mathcal{T}$, these underlying observables *do* peacefully coexist. Therefore, $\Sigma_\sqcup \equiv \Sigma_X \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_Z \underline{\otimes} \cdots$. Since the individual spaces Σ_j are simplexes, so is $\Sigma_\sqcup$. So long as an underlying JD exists for the properties, such an underlying theory $\mathcal{T}_\sqcup$ exists. The ontological model that it can provide for the overlying operational theory $\mathcal{T}$ is discussed below. In particular, the elements $\partial\Sigma_\sqcup$ are taken to constitute the underlying ontic states λ.

The relationship between the simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ and the nonsimplex Σ of $\mathcal{T}$, represented by the mapping $\varphi : \Sigma_\sqcup \to \Sigma$, cannot be linear-injective, since this would preserve the simplex property. It is convenient to think of φ as the composition of two maps: $\varphi \equiv \varphi_\star \circ \varphi_\triangledown$.

The map $\varphi_\triangledown : \Sigma_\sqcup \to \Sigma_\cup$, where $\Sigma_\cup$ is either an intermediate underlying simplex or an intermediate underlying gdit space such that

$$\dim(\Sigma_\cup) = \dim(\Sigma). \tag{36}$$

Therefore, for a nonclassical m-input-n-output regular theory with pairwise incongruent observables, $\varphi_\triangledown$ reduces the dimensionality exponentially from $\dim(\Sigma_\sqcup) = n^m - 1$ to $\dim(\Sigma) = m(n-1)$. It is convenient to call the map $\varphi_\triangledown$ as *compression*.

Typically, map $\varphi_\triangledown$ does not introduce uncertainty. This introduction happens via the partial function of *crumpling*, $\varphi_\star : \Sigma_\cup \to \Sigma$, which is such that $\varphi_\star^{-1} : \Sigma \to \Sigma_\cup$ is an embedding. We refer to $\varphi_\star$ as a *crumpling* map because it introduces vertices and faces. We call the map φ and the corresponding ontological model as g-type (resp., s-type) if space $\Sigma_\cup$ is a gdit space (resp., simplex).

The term Σ-*ontology* will refer to this general procedure for constructing an ontological model on the basis of the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ and the intermediate underlier $\Sigma_\cup$. An example is given by Figure 1, where the regular theory is the inner square. The the outer square represents an intermediate underlying theory $\Sigma_\cup$, while the tetrahedron (not shown) is the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$.

1. G-type ontological model

Here the intermediate space $\Sigma_\cup$ is the m-input-n-output gdit theory, which one may call the *underlying gdit theory*. It preserves the n^m extreme points

of $\Sigma_\sqcup$ such that $\varphi_\triangledown : \partial\Sigma_\sqcup \mapsto \partial\Sigma_\cup$ is a one-to-one-correspondence. If the points in $\Sigma_\sqcup$ are represented in a barycentric coordinate system $\mathcal{B}$, then those in $\Sigma_\cup$ can be expressed using a generalized barycentric coordinate system $\mathcal{G}$ derived from $\mathcal{B}$ using $\varphi_\triangledown$. Owing to the non-simpliciality of the gdit theory, the representation in $\mathcal{G}$ in general won't be unique.

Example. Suppose there are two fiducial observables X, Z taking values $x, z \in \{0, 1\}$ in the operational theory characterized by the pure states in Eq. (7). Here the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ is the 3-simplex generated by four vertices $\lambda_j \equiv x \otimes z$ ($j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$). In the barycentric coordinate system, the λ_j's are the states in Eq. (3).

Employing the generalized barycentric coordinates for $\Sigma_\cup$, we can express the action of $\varphi_\triangledown$ on pure states of $\Sigma_\sqcup$ by $\varphi_\triangledown(x \otimes z) = (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Given a point in $\Sigma_\sqcup$ described by the barycentric coordinates (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4), where $a_j \geq 0$, $\sum_j a_j = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_\triangledown[(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)] &= \sum_{j=1}^{4} a_j \varphi_\triangledown(\lambda_j) \\ &= a_1(0,0) + a_2(0,1) + a_3(1,0) + a_4(1,1) \\ &= (a_3 + a_4, a_2 + a_4), \\ &\equiv (a_1 + a_2, a_3 + a_4 \mid a_1 + a_3, a_2 + a_4) \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $(0,0), (0,1), (1,0)$ and $(1,1)$ are the vertices of the underlying gdit theory. Note that distinct interior points in $\Sigma_\sqcup$ may map to the same point in $\Sigma_\cup$, since the vertices $\varphi_\triangledown(\lambda_j)$ are not linearly independent. For instance, the distinct ontic mixtures $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ in the underlying simplex map to the same mixture $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \equiv (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ in the gdit theory. ∎

In Figure 1, space $\Sigma_\cup$ is represented by the outer square and operational space Σ by the circle or the inner square. Map $\varphi_\star^{-1}$ embeds the circle in the outer square $\Sigma_\cup$. The square is obtained by compressing set $\Sigma_\sqcup$ (a 3-simplex, not shown in the figure) via the map $\varphi_\triangledown$. This compresses the tetrahedron to the square.

Example. In our approach, Spekkens' toy theory [25] has the following operational description. There are three pairwise incongruent observables X, Y, Z, with Σ given as the convex hull of:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_X^+ &\equiv (1, 0 \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \psi_X^- &\equiv (0, 1 \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \psi_Y^+ &\equiv (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid 1, 0 \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \psi_Y^- &\equiv (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid 0, 1 \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \psi_Z^+ &\equiv (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid 1, 0) \\ \psi_Z^+ &\equiv (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid 0, 1). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The nonsimpliciality of Σ is a consequence of dependences among the extreme states:

$$\begin{aligned}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{1}{2}(\psi_X^+ + \psi_X^-) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\psi_Y^+ + \psi_Y^-) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\psi_Z^+ + \psi_Z^-). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Therefore the various nonclassical features noted in Spekkens' toy theory are seen to follow essentially from the nonsimpliciality of Σ in that theory.

The underlying simplex is

$$\Sigma_\sqcup = \Sigma_X \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_Y \underline{\otimes} \Sigma_Z, \tag{40}$$

of dimensionality $\dim(\Sigma_\sqcup) = 7$. Since for the toy theory $D = 3$, therefore $\Sigma_\cup$ is the three-dimensional 3-input-2-output gdit theory, with vertices given by the 8 states $\gamma_{4^j+2^k+l+1} \equiv (j, k, l)$ in Cartesian coordinates, and $j, k, l \in \{0, 1\}$. The compression map is given by $\varphi_\triangledown(j \otimes k \otimes l) = (j, k, l)$, where the ontic elements $\lambda \equiv (j \otimes k \otimes l)$ are the 8 extreme points of the 7-simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$, and distinct from Spekkens' ontic set of 4 points (which are the extreme points of the $\Sigma_\cup$ in the s-type ontology, discussed below).

In the g-type ontology, the Spekkens toy theory corresponds to the octahedron formed as the convex hull of the six face-centers of the 3-input-2-output gdit theory. The ontic representation of the states (38) in terms of the intermediate gdit theory is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_X^+ &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 + \gamma_4) \\ \mu_X^- &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_5 + \gamma_6 + \gamma_7 + \gamma_8) \\ \mu_Y^+ &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_5 + \gamma_6) \\ \mu_Y^- &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_3 + \gamma_4 + \gamma_7 + \gamma_8) \\ \mu_Z^+ &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 + \gamma_5 + \gamma_7) \\ \mu_Z^- &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_2 + \gamma_4 + \gamma_6 + \gamma_8), \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

which are just the generalized barycentric coordinates in the gdit theory.

A geometrization of Spekkens' toy theory using precisely four ontic points, based on s-type Σ-ontology, is discussed below.

2. S-type ontological model

In this type of model, the intermediate space $\Sigma_\cup$ is taken to be the D-simplex, where $D \equiv \dim(\Sigma)$. Thus, $\varphi_\triangledown$ is a function that preserves the simplicial property.

The crumpling map $\varphi_\star$ introduces nonsimpliciality, in addition to uncertainty. This idea can be illustrated by giving an s-type model for Spekkens' toy theory [25], in contrast to the g-type given above.

Example. For the Spekkens toy theory, whose Σ is the convex hull of the states (38), the intermediate underlying simplex $\Sigma_\cup$ is the 3-simplex, or tetrahedron. The compression function $\varphi_\triangledown$ maps the 7-simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$, defined in (40), to this. Here $\Sigma_\cup$ is taken to be the convex hull of any four convex independent points γ'_j in $\mathbb{R}^3$. In particular, we can take $\gamma'_1 \equiv (0,0,0), \gamma'_2 \equiv (0,1,1), \gamma'_3 \equiv (1,0,1)$ and $\gamma'_4 \equiv (1,1,0)$.

The state space Σ in Spekkens toy theory is the octahedron formed as the convex hull of the six face-centers of the above 3-simplex, which serves as $\Sigma_\cup$, with vertices $\{\gamma'_j\}$ $(j \in \{1,2,3,4\})$. The ontic representation in terms of the intermediate underlying simplex is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_X^{+\prime} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma'_1 + \gamma'_2) \\
\mu_X^{-\prime} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma'_3 + \gamma'_4) \\
\mu_Y^{+\prime} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma'_1 + \gamma'_3) \\
\mu_Y^{-\prime} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma'_2 + \gamma'_4) \\
\mu_Z^{+\prime} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma'_1 + \gamma'_4) \\
\mu_Z^{-\prime} &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma'_2 + \gamma'_3),
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

which may be contrasted with the g-type representation, Eq. (41). ∎

This geometric containment of state space Σ in the above 3-simplex for Spekkens' toy theory's was first shown in [37].

B. Impossible universal operations

We define a *coherent transformation* U in an operational $\mathcal{T}$ as one that reversibly maps any pure state to another pure state. An instance of a coherent operation for a theory with $N = 2$ is the inverter, which transforms any state to another which is orthogonal in the sense of being deterministically distinguishable from the initial state. Thus, the inverter is fully specified by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_X^+) &\longleftrightarrow |\psi_X^-), \\
|\psi_Z^+) &\longleftrightarrow |\psi_Z^-),
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

for the theory determined by pure states (7). In quantum mechanics, it is known that there exists no universal inverter [38]. Spekkens showed [25] that an analogous non-invertibility result exists is his model. His proof, which employs an ontological argument, proceeds along the following lines.

In the ontic representation (42) of the states (38), to implement $\psi_X^+ \longleftrightarrow \psi_X^-$ and $\psi_Y^+ \longleftrightarrow \psi_Y^-$, it is seen that the requisite ontic transformation is

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma'_1 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma'_4 \\
\gamma'_2 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma'_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Applying this to $\mu_Z^\pm$, it is clear that this the transformation (44) doesn't work, implying that the coherent operation (43) is disallowed.

This observation prompts the question of whether an analogous result can be produced for any operational theory $\mathcal{T}$ with non-simplicial space Σ in the Σ-ontology. Here, in the spirit of Spekkens' argument, it may be assumed that coherent transformations in the operational theory should have a representation in terms of reversible transformations among the ontic states λ in the ontological model $\mathcal{T}_\sqcup$ or in the intermediate underlying model in the g-type ontology. Then universal coherent operations can be shown not to exist.

To see this we note that Spekkens' proof, in our terminology, employs the s-type ontology. However, it is readily verified that in the g-type ontology, the following ontic transformation indeed implements the universal inverter (43):

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_8 \\
\gamma_2 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_7 \\
\gamma_3 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_6 \\
\gamma_4 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_5.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

This shows that this nonclassicality is dependent on the ontological model. From the perspective of interpretation, this result says that if certain coherent operations are not observed, then it restricts the class of possible underlying classical explanations.

Mathematically, the result shows that by increasing the number of ontic states for the same operational theory, we can create more "space for maneurvre". Given a discrete m-input-n-output theory $\mathcal{T}$, with space Σ, $|\partial\Sigma| = mn$ pure states, and dimension $D_\mathcal{T} = m(n-1)$, we have for the underlying simplex, $D_\sqcup = n^m - 1$ and $|\partial\Sigma_\sqcup| = n^m$. The cardinality $|\partial\Sigma|$ is exponentially smaller than $|\partial\Sigma_\sqcup|$. More generally, $\partial\Sigma$ could be arbitrarily enlarged within a fixed underlying $\Sigma_\sqcup$. The theory represented by the circular disk in Figure 1 is such an example.

There are in all $|\partial\Sigma|!$ permutations and hence distinct coherent transformations in $\mathcal{T}$. In the underlying theory, there are $|\partial\Sigma_\sqcup|!$ ontic permutations. If $|\partial\Sigma|! > |\partial\Sigma_\sqcup|!$, and hence $|\partial\Sigma| > |\partial\Sigma_\sqcup|$, then one there will coherent operations that are impossible in the Σ-ontology, but whether such coherent operations are physically interesting is another matter.

As an illustration, we can show how to include arbitrarily many pure points through the function $\varphi_\star$, to create such impossibilities. Given ontic states (3), from Eq. (37) we obtain the ontic probability distributions for states in

(7) to be:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_X^+ &= (\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0,0),\\ \mu_X^- &= (0,0,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}),\\ \mu_Z^+ &= (\frac{1}{2},0,\frac{1}{2},0),\\ \mu_Z^- &= (0,\frac{1}{2},0,\frac{1}{2}).\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The operational theory characterized by space Σ which is the convex hull of the states (7) is a non-simplex geometrically contained within the underlying gdit theory $\Sigma_\cup$.

This theory can be described as a nonsimplex in the convex hull of the classical states (3). From Eq. (46), we see that the ontic operations

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_4,\\ \gamma_2 &\longleftrightarrow \gamma_3,\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

indeed implement inversion (43).

Suppose we add to $\mathcal{T}$ any state quantumly realizable through a rotation with angle θ in the $X-Z$ (equatorial) plane. This is seen to be:

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_Y^+) &= (\delta, 1-\delta \mid \upsilon, 1-\upsilon)\\ |\psi_Y^-) &= (1-\delta, \delta \mid 1-\upsilon, \upsilon)\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &\equiv \frac{1}{2}(1+\sin\theta)\\ \upsilon &\equiv \cos^2(\frac{\theta}{2}).\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

These can be derived from the corresponding ontic distributions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_Y^+ &= (\delta\upsilon, \delta(1-\upsilon), (1-\delta)\upsilon, (1-\delta)(1-\upsilon)),\\ \mu_Y^- &= ((1-\delta)(1-\upsilon), (1-\delta)\upsilon, \delta(1-\upsilon), \delta\upsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where $0 \leq \delta, \upsilon \leq 1$. Clearly, if the added pure points have the pattern (50), then $\mu_Y^+ \longleftrightarrow \mu_Y^-$ under ontic transformation (47), making all pure states are invertible.

However, consider the coherent transformation defined by:

$$\psi_X^\pm \longleftrightarrow \psi_Z^\pm \tag{51a}$$

$$\psi_Y^+ \longleftrightarrow \psi_Y^-. \tag{51b}$$

Eq. (51a) requires γ_1 to transform to γ_2 or γ_3, neither of which is congruent with the Eq. (51b), as seen in Eq. (50). However, clearly the operation (51) is rather artificical.

On the other hand, the existence of fewer pure states in the overlying theory $\mathcal{T}$ than extreme points in the underlying $\Sigma_\sqcup$ does not guarantee that all universal coherent operations are possible. To see this, suppose we replace the last two states in Eq. (38) by:

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_Z^+) &\equiv (\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3} \mid \frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2} \mid 1,0)\\ |\psi_Z^-) &\equiv (\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3} \mid \frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2} \mid 0,1).\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

In this case, the resulting theory remains nonsimplicial, but the Z eigenstates satisfy $\frac{1}{2}(\psi_Z^+ + \psi_Z^-) = (\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3} \mid \frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2} \mid \frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_Z^+ &= \frac{1}{6}(\gamma_1+\gamma_3) + \frac{2}{6}(\gamma_5+\gamma_7)\\ \mu_Z^- &= \frac{1}{6}(\gamma_2+\gamma_4) + \frac{2}{6}(\gamma_6+\gamma_8),\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

instead of the last two equations in (41). It is observed that in this case there is no ontic permutation of the kind (45), implying the lack of existence of a universal inverter.

C. Preparation contextuality and nonsimpliciality

Suppose there are different preparations $P, P', \cdots$ that lead to the same outcome statistics in the operational theory $\mathcal{T}$ such that for all measurements M, $p(k|M,P) = p(k|M,P') = \cdots$. Thus, operationally, these preparations are indistinguishable or equivalent. Consider the ontological model for these preparations, given by the underlying probability distributions $\mu_P(\lambda), \mu_{P'}(\lambda), \cdots$ over ontic states λ. If $\mu_P(\lambda) = \mu_{P'}(\lambda) = \cdots$, i.e., they are also ontologically indistinguishable, then theory $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be preparation non-contextual; else, the theory is preparation contextual [31].

Consider the regular theory determined by pure states (7). It satisfies the condition (15), in which the LHS and RHS represent distinct mixtures. The pure states are described by the ontological probability distributions $\mu_X^\pm$ and $\mu_Z^\pm$ given by (46). Since these ontological distributions satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}(\mu_X^+(\lambda) + \mu_X^-(\lambda)) &= \frac{1}{2}(\mu_Z^+(\lambda) + \mu_Z^-(\lambda)),\\ &= (\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4})\\ &\equiv \mathcal{Y},\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

the corresponding ontic mixtures also are indistinguishable and therefore preparation contextuality cannot be demonstrated in this case.

If the Y-outcomes are taken to be given by Eq. (48), then we have from Eqs. (50) and (49)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}(\mu_Y^+(\lambda) + \mu_Y^-(\lambda)) &= \frac{1}{4}(1+\xi, 1-\xi, 1-\xi, 1+\xi)\\ &\neq \mathcal{Y},\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $\xi \equiv \frac{\sin(2\theta)}{2}$, giving a similar argument for preparation contextuality. Thus, only cases $\theta = 0$ (corresponding to X) and $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (corresponding to Z) are the two exceptional, preparation noncontextual cases.

The above counterexamples to preparation contextuality illustrate the following general result.

Theorem 6 *A nonclassical theory $\mathcal{T}$ is in general preparation contextual in the Σ-ontology.*

Proof. Quite generally, let $\mathcal{T}$ be a regular theory embedded in the gdit theory $\mathcal{T}_\cup$, which is the convex hull of pure points g_j ($j \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, N\}$).

A nonsimpliciality condition in $\mathcal{T}_\cup$ has the form:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{M} g_j = \sum_{k=M+1}^{N} g_k, \tag{56}$$

where $M + 1 < N$ and the LHS and RHS represent preparation-like contexts, though not proper preparation contexts because gdit theories lack unambiguous preparability of pure states (cf. Section IV B).

Although map $\varphi_\triangledown$ is non-injective, the map $\varphi_\triangledown^{-1}$ is one-to-one when applied to the pure points g_j's and thus well defined for the domain $\{g_j\}$. However, upon inverting the individual g_j's in the LHS and RHS of Eq. (56), we find by virtue of the simpliciality of the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$, that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{M} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_j) \neq \sum_{k=M+1}^{N} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_k), \tag{57}$$

which is a manifestation of the fact that $\varphi_\triangledown$ is non-injective. Inequality (57) implies a preparation-like contextuality, since it demonstrates the two preparation-like contexts in the gdit theory are distinguishable ontologically.

Now consider the nonsimpliciality condition in the regular theory $\mathcal{T}$:

$$\sum_j \psi_j = \sum_k \phi_k, \tag{58}$$

where ψ_j and ϕ_k are possibly un-normalized basis states from two different bases. Eq. (58) would be trivial if both the LHS and RHS independently sum to same quantity, typically $\sum_{j=0}^{N} g_j$, and thus (58) would not make use of the nonsimpliciality (56) of the underlying gdit theory.

Quite generally, the condition (58) can be satisfied by the requirement:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \psi_i &= f\left[\sum_{j=0}^{M} g_j\right] + (1-f)\left[\sum_{k=M+1}^{N} g_k\right] \\
\sum_i \phi_i &= g\left[\sum_{j=0}^{M} g_j\right] + (1-g)\left[\sum_{k=M+1}^{N} g_k\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $0 \leq f, g \leq 1$ and it is not necessary that $f = g$. Then we derive (58) nontrivially because in this case we must make use of Eq. (56). The trivial case corresponds to $f = g$.

Mapping the two LHS in (59) to the underlying simplex by applying $\varphi_\triangledown^{-1}$ to the g_j's we obtain the corresponding mixtures in the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_\triangledown^{-1} : \sum_i \psi_i &\mapsto f\left[\sum_{j=0}^{M} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_j)\right] + (1-f)\left[\sum_{k=M+1}^{M+N} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_k)\right] \\
&\equiv \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(\Psi) \\
\varphi_\triangledown^{-1} : \sum_i \phi_i &\mapsto g\left[\sum_{j=0}^{M} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_j)\right] + (1-g)\left[\sum_{k=M+1}^{M+N} \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(g_k)\right] \\
&\equiv \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(\Phi).
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

However, in view of Eq. (57), it follows that

$$\varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(\Psi) \neq \varphi_\triangledown^{-1}(\Phi), \tag{61}$$

entailing that two distinct underlying states map to the same mixture in the overlying theory $\mathcal{T}$, which implies preparation contextuality. ∎

As a simple illustration of preparation contextuality in Σ-ontology, note that in the case of the 2-input-2-output gdit theory, the nonsimpliciality condition among the four extreme points (j, k), where $j, k \in \{0, 1\}$, is given by:

$$\frac{1}{2}[(0,0) + (1,1)] = \frac{1}{2}[(0,1) + (1,0)]. \tag{62}$$

Under $\varphi_\triangledown^{-1}$, the LHS maps to the mixture $(1, 0, 0, 1)$ in the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$, whilst the RHS maps to $(0, 1, 1, 0)$.

According to Theorem 6, we obtain preparation contextuality for bases in which the uniform mixture of the eigenstates should correspond to an ontic mixture in $\Sigma_\sqcup$ of the form (a, b, b, a) where $2(a+b) = 1$ while $a \neq b$. This explains why we fail to obtain a proof for preparation contextuality using the observables X and Z, as determined by Eq. (7), in view of (54). On the other hand, by a similar argument, any two observables Y parametrized by two distinct values of $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ in Eq. (50) yield an argument for preparation contextuality by virtue of Eq. (55).

All the above nonclassical features, whether with reference to the ontology or not, require only measurement incongruence, without reference to the question of the transitivity of congruence or its extendability to higher orders. These features correspond to what we call as base level nonclassicality. In the following sections, we shall consider nonclassical phenomena arising when congruence is not transitive or extendable to higher orders, and correspond to so-called "higher-level" nonclassicality.

VI. FROM INCONGRUENCE TO CONTEXTUALITY

The preceding theorems show that many nonclassical features can be qualitatively explained from the pairwise incongruence of properties. It does not completely specify the nature of nonclassicality for regular theories with more than two fiducial properties. Now if pairwise congruence is transitive, then it is straightforward to extend the above nonclassicality to more than two observables. But if it is intransitive, then a potential inconsistency looms ahead in the sense that there is no unique prescription of which observables should be simultaneously value definite. An operational theory "has the choice" of prohibiting such intransitivity in the congruence structure, or providing a new receipe to tackle the situation, namely prohibiting such higher-order congruence and comeasurability that would produce such a contradiction.

Accordingly, regular theories for which the theorems 1 through 4 suffice to fully capture their (non)classical behavior are called *simple theories*. To go beyond simple theories, definitions pertaining to (in)transitivity and (un)extendability of binary and higher-order relations are required, which are presented in Section VI A and applied to congruence and single system correlations in Section VI B, where a fundamental connection to JD is proved.

Simple theories demonstrate *base-level nonclassicality*. Nonclassical theories for which these theorems are insufficient for a full characterization, are non-simple, and demonstrate *higher-level nonclassicality*. Simple and non-simple theories are studied from a combinatorial perspective in terms of their congruence structure in Section VI E. A condition under which the connection between joint measurability and the absence of JD is tight, is pointed out in Section VI C. Our approach also allows for higher-order correlation effects beyond QM, and we suggest why they may not be physically realized in Section VI D.

A. Transitivity and extendability of relations

Let set $S \equiv \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \cdots\}$. A binary relation R_2 between pairs of elements of set S is an equivalence relation if it is reflexive ($R_2(\alpha,\alpha)$), symmetric ($R_2(\alpha,\beta) \longleftrightarrow R_2(\beta,\alpha)$) and transitive ($R_2(\alpha,\beta), R_2(\beta,\gamma) \rightarrow R_2(\alpha,\gamma)$). An equivalence relation R_2 provides a partition of set S into equivalence classes, such that R_2 holds for any two elements within a class, and fails for elements from different classes.

In mathematics, the concept of equivalence has been generalized to a ternary and higher n-ary relations, according to the following scheme.

Definition. A *ternary relation* (denoted $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$) between objects of set $S \equiv \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \cdots\}$ is a ternary equivalence relation if it is

1. Symmetric: $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma) \longleftrightarrow R_3([\alpha,\beta,\gamma])$, where $[\cdots]$ indicates all cyclic permutations.
2. Reflexive: $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ if not all α,β,γ are distinct. Thus, it holds generally that $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\beta)$ and $R_3(\alpha,\alpha,\beta)$ for any α,β.
3. Transitivity: If $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma), R_3(\alpha,\beta,\delta)$, then $R_3(\alpha,\gamma,\delta)$ and $R_3(\beta,\gamma,\delta)$. ∎

The paradigmatic example of a ternary relation is the collinearity of three points in Euclidean geometry. The ternary equivalent of partitions of the binary case are pencils in the context of incidence geometry forming a linear space. The above definitions indicate how the concept of equivalence can be extended to cover quarternary and higher n-ary relations.

This is useful when a binary relation can be naturally extended to higher orders, e.g., equality, congruence, siblinghood, etc. For example, the binary relation $\mathfrak{C}_2(\alpha,\beta) \equiv$ "α is a sibling of β" has a natural extension to an m-ary relation $\mathfrak{C}_m(\{\alpha_j\}) \equiv$ "α_j's are siblings". We shall refer to the unindexed label (e.g., $\mathfrak{C}$) as a *relation template* and the label with index m, where $m = 2, 3, \cdots$ (e.g., $\mathfrak{C}_m$) as its m-ary instantiation. In the above example, $\mathfrak{C}$ refers to the generic relation "siblinghood".

Given an extendable relation denoted by template R, if the $|S|$-th order relation $R_{|S|}$ holds for a set S, then $R_{|s|}$ must to hold for any subset $s \subset S$. In other words, an extendable relation must be *backward consistent*.

Definition. Given an m-ary relation R_m, the *relation chain* over a set S is a sequence of relationships

$$\mathbf{R}_m \equiv R_m(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m), R_m(\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_m), \cdots, \qquad (63)$$

where $\alpha_j, \beta_k \in S$, such that each pair of consecutive terms in the sequence is the antecedent (the "if$\cdots$" part) of a transitivity conditional in the definition of an equivalence relation. ∎

For example, given theory $\mathcal{T}$ in which the binary relation R_2 is defined, consider the sequence

$$R_2(\alpha,\beta), R_2(\beta,\gamma), R_2(\gamma,\delta) \qquad (64)$$

The first two terms are such that transitivity of R_2 would entail $R_2(\alpha,\gamma)$, whereas $\neg R_2(\alpha,\gamma)$ would demonstrate intransitivity. Similarly, for the last two terms. Thus, the sequence in (64) is a R_2-chain. On the other hand, the sequence $R_2(\alpha,\beta), R_2(\beta,\gamma), R_2(\delta,\epsilon)$ is not, since the last two terms cannot be the antecedent of the transitivity conditional.

For a theory equipped with transitive R_2, in Eq. (64) the first two terms imply $R_2(\alpha,\gamma)$ and then the possibility of *extension* to $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ may be considered. If this extendability of the relation holds (i.e., $R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ is true) but $R_2(\alpha,\gamma)$ is not, this would violate backward consistency (which we shall require in all "nice" theories). Likewise, the second two relationships in (64) imply $R_2(\beta,\delta)$, and it may be the case that $R_3(\beta,\gamma,\delta)$.

Therefore, a transitive R_2 allows us to go from (64) to the R_3-chain:

$$\mathbf{R}_3 \equiv R_3(\alpha,\beta,\gamma), R_3(\beta,\gamma,\delta), \cdots . \tag{65}$$

Assuming backward consistency, only if R_3 is transitive, may the R_4-chain(s), denoted $\mathbf{R}_4$, exist. (Note that multiple chains may result, because the consequent (the "then$\cdots$" part) of the transitivity conditional in the definition of an equivalence class may imply more than one statement. And so on to any higher order m. Assuming existence and transitivity at each order, we can analogously construct higher-order relations R_n and relation chains $\mathbf{R}_n$.

A relation template R such that every R_2-chain can be extended (in the way described above) to a higher-order m-ary relation chain is said to be *super-transitive*, which can be characterized as described below.

Definition. The sequence of higher-order equivalence relation chains

$$\aleph \equiv \mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3, \cdots, \mathbf{R}_m, \mathbf{R}_{m+1}, \cdots \tag{66}$$

constitutes a *relation string*. Given that a relation string terminates at order m, it is convenient to refer to the quantity $m-1$ (since the sequence $\aleph$ starts at $m=2$) as the string *length*. The set of all distinct relation strings in theory $\mathcal{T}$ (over different sets of observables) is denoted a *relation stringscape*. ∎

If at some order m, the relation denoted by the template R is intransitive, then (assuming backward consistency) the sequence of relation chains $\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3, \cdots, \mathbf{R}_m$ terminates at order m. But the converse is not true. Termination can happen even without intransitivity at the preceding order. We refer to the former as *ordinary termination*, and the latter *extraordinary termination*. We shall return to this issue later.

Definition. The string length minimized over all relation strings in the stringscape is the *order* of supertransitivity of a relation R, and denoted Θ. ∎

The parameter Θ summarizes for us the relevant property of a relation R. It quantifies the number of properties that can peacefully coexist in a theory in the worst case scenario. Thus, $\Theta = \infty$ is a necessary condition for classicality.

B. Simple theories and JD

The theorems in Section III establish nonclassical features arising from pairwise incongruence of observables. They are sufficient to fix the properties of *simple* theories, which are theories for which either $\Theta = 0$ or $\Theta = \infty$, where Θ refers to the congruence relation.

Simple theories thus comprise of classical theory ($\Theta = \infty$), the regular, nonclassical theory in which all (functionally independent) observables have pairwise incongruence, i.e., $\mathbf{R}_2$ does not hold for any pair of elements ($\Theta = 0$), and finally, the nonclassical theory with transitive congruence such that all observables in the same congruence equivalence class are jointly measurable (again, $\Theta = \infty$).

The theorems of Section III are not enough to describe a *non-simple* theory. For example, given a regular theory with three observables such that $R_2(X,Y)$ and $R_2(Y,Z)$ but $\neg R_2(X,Z)$, then transitivity of congruence fails, and it is not clear how the structure of the full space Σ relates to the associated spaces.

In particular, in QM, consider the set $\{x, y, p_x\}$, where the three elements represent positions in the spatial $x-$ and $y-$ directions, and p_x is the x-component of momentum. We have $\mathbf{R}_2 \equiv R_2(x,y), R_2(y,p_x)$, but $\neg R_2(x,p_x)$ and $\neg R_3(x,y,p_x)$. Thus, for QM, order $\Theta = 1$. An example of $\Theta = 2$ is the "extended overprotective seer" (XOS) toy theory mentioned later.

Two theories having $\Theta = \infty$ may be mentioned. The trivial one is classical theory, where there is no incongruence. The most general nonclassical theory with $\Theta = \infty$ is $\mathcal{T}^*$, where pairs of observables can be incongruent, but congruence exists at all orders.

Theorem 7 *If a regular operational theory $\mathcal{T}$ is simple, then all states in $\mathcal{T}$ have a joint distribution (JD) in an outcome-deterministic underlying model.*

Proof. For the case where $\Theta = 0$, given observables $X, Y, Z, \cdots$, one can always construct the JD in an underlying theory, given by $P(x,y,z,\cdots) := P(x)P(y)P(z)\cdots$. For $\Theta = \infty$, the classical case is trivial. Consider the most general nonclassical case, discussed above. Since R_2 is an equivalence relation in this theory, consider the partition of all observables into equivalence classes $\mathcal{Q}_j$, whereby all observables $Q_j^{(k)}$ within the class are congruent, and any two observables in different classes, such as $Q_m^{(j)}$ and $Q_n^{(k)}$ $(m \neq n)$ are incongruent. By virtue of transitivity at all orders, all observables in a given equivalence class are jointly congruent and therefore jointly measurable.

We can thus treat each equivalence class as a single "class observable" $\mathcal{Q}_j$ determined by a probability distribution P_j^Q. Therefore we can always write down a JD in an underlying (outcome deterministic) model for all observables, given by:

$$P(q_1^{(1)}, q_2^{(2)}, \cdots, q_2^{(1)}, q_2^{(2)}, \cdots) = P_1^Q P_2^Q \cdots \tag{67}$$

where the LHS denotes the probability over all observables in the theory. ∎

In light of this result, the existence of incongruence is necessary but not sufficient for a Kochen-Specker theorem contextuality [24]. A non-trivial super-transitive structure of congruence is required to thwart JD.

C. Measurement congruence and JD

The lack of JD to account for measurement statistics provides an additional overlay of deviation from peaceful coexistence of observables, beyond incongruence and hence beyond nonsimpliciality of the state space. As will be clear later, only a nonclassical theory in which of absence JD entails nonsimpliciality, is well motivated. Otherwise, this absence would simply correspond to classical signal mechanism at the operational level. However, nonsimpliciality does not prohibit JD, as noted. In specific situations, it can be arranged so that the lack of JD arises precisely when measurement incongruence is present. In such a case, a tight connection can be obtained between incongruence and lack of JD.

As a particular example, consider the theory (fragmet) $\mathcal{T}_{2,2}$ consisting of four observables, $\mathcal{A} \equiv \{A_1, A_2\}$ and $\mathcal{B} \equiv \{B_1, B_2\}$, such that any element of $\mathcal{A}$ is congruent with any element of $\mathcal{B}$, i.e., $R_2(A_j, B_k)$, where R represents the congruence relation template. Now suppose we have $\neg R_2(A_1, A_2)$ but $R_2(B_1, B_2)$, i.e., incongruence on only one side. We then have intransitivity from the chains $R_2(A_1, B_1), R_2(B_1, A_2)$ and $R_2(A_1, B_2), R_2(B_2, A_2)$. However, this does not lead to lack of JD, because we can construct a JD based on the quantities that can be jointly measured:

$$P(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) = \frac{P(A_1, B_1, B_2)P(A_2, B_1, B_2)}{P(B_1, B_2)}, \quad (68)$$

which has been constructed such that tracing out A_1 or A_2 or A_1, A_2 returns the operational probabilities. Thus, the intransitivity of congruence, though necessary for, is not sufficient for the absence of JD. On the other hand, in the above example, if we have incongruence among both the A_j's and B_k's, i.e., $\neg R_2(A_1, A_2)$ and $\neg R_2(B_1, B_2)$, then it can be shown that JD does not exist.

Therefore, in such a $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ scenario, we obtain a tight link between congruence and JD, which clarifies such a link studied by various authors [11–15].

D. Higher-order congruence: why quantum?

We now present the XOS theory, a toy theory to illustrate supertransitivity beyond QM, namely $\Theta = 2$, and indicate how it can be extended to arbitrarily high orders of supertransitivity. The following definition is useful.

Definition. The *transitivity structure* Θ^* of a relation template R in a finite theory $\mathcal{T}$ is the pair (Θ, x), where x takes the value $\lhd$ (resp., $\rhd$) if the relation string $\mathbf{R}_{\Theta+1}$ terminates ordinarily (resp., extraordinarily). ∎

We are concerned here with the transitivity structure pertaining to the relationship of congruence. QM is characterized by ordinary termination. If R_3 fails for a set of three observables, then necessarily R_2 fails for a pair of the trio. QM is characterized by the structure $(1, \lhd)$.

We shall now give examples of structures $(1, \rhd)$, i.e., one where R_3 fails even though R_2 holds for all observables; and an example for $(2, \rhd)$, defined analogously. An example of the former is provided by Specker's "overprotective seer" (OS) correlations [39], described thus. Let A, B and C be three two-valued observables, such that any two are congruent and can be measured, and the outcomes will be anticorrelated with equal probability. However, they lack ternary congruence.

This is seen by showing that no JD over observables A, B, C exists. If it did, it must be probability distribution of the 8 three-bit string $abc \in \{0, 1\}^3$. Anticorrelation on AB and on BC implies abc is of the pattern 010 or 101, but in this case AC will not be anticorrelated.

From an experimental test, a purported OS correlation must violate the inequality

$$\langle AB \rangle + \langle BC \rangle + \langle CA \rangle \geq -1, \quad (69)$$

since, as noted above, at most only two pairs can be anticorrelated in a noncontextual way.

The OS theory, which is of the type $\Theta^* = (1, \rhd)$, can be extended to produce a XOS theory of type $\Theta^* = (2, \rhd)$, i.e., one characterized by the existence and transitivity of 3-comeasurability (R_3), but the failure of 4-comeasurability (R_4). Suppose there are four 3-valued observables, taking values 0, 1, 2, such that any three observables can be measured, but not all four.

We now consider the state ρ in this theory, which has the property that for any three-observable measurement, all three outcomes must be distinct. There is no JD over measurement outcomes a, b, c and d that can satisfy this. To see this suppose that we assign 0, 1, 2 to A, B, C. Then to satisfy the distinctness requirement for B, C, D, we should assign 0 to D. However, this assignment scheme will imply that measuring A, B, D would yield $0, 1, 0$, violating the outcome distinctness requirement.

This contextual correlation in the extended OS theory can be experimentally tested via the violation of the inequality:

$$\langle \overline{ABC} \rangle + \langle \overline{BCD} \rangle + \langle \overline{CDA} \rangle + \langle \overline{DAB} \rangle \leq 2, \quad (70)$$

where each of the four summands is experimentally determined as follows.

For any three jointly measured observables (say A, B, C), in each trial determine the maximum, intermediate and minimum outcomes of the three measurements, which are denoted $v_{\max}, v_{\text{mid}}$ and $v_{\min}$, respectively, provided the three are distinct. If the three outcomes are not distinct but one of them is distinct from the other two, then assign $v_{\max}$ (resp., $v_{\min}$) to the larger (resp., smaller) outcome and assign v_{mid} to the outcome is majority. (E.g., if measuring A, B, C produces outcomes 0,1,1 then assign 0 to $v_{\min}$ and 1 to both v_{mid} and $v_{\max}$.) If all three outcomes of a three-observable measurement are identical, then assign that value uniformly to $v_{\max}, v_{\text{mid}}$ and $v_{\min}$.

For any three observables (say A, B, C), the quantity

$$\overline{ABC} \equiv \langle (v_{\max} - v_{\text{mid}})(v_{\text{mid}} - v_{\min}) \rangle, \qquad (71)$$

where the angles indicate the average over a number of trials. In each trial, the quantity $(v_{\max} - v_{\text{mid}})(v_{\text{mid}} - v_{\min})$ is 1 only if the outcomes are distinct (i.e., 0,1,2), and zero otherwise (e.g., 0,1,1 or 1,1,1). The other summands in Eq. (70) are calculated in this way. For any noncontextual value assignment of A, B, C, D, it may be checked that the LHS is bounded above by 2. On the other hand, for XOS theory, the LHS of (70) attains the algebraic maximum of 4.

The above concept of a nonclassical theory with $\Theta^* = (2, \triangleright)$ can similarly be extended to analogous higher-order theories, with $\Theta^* = (n, \triangleright)$ for $n > 2$.

The above consideration about other possible structures prompts us to reflect on why QM has the structure $\Theta^* = (1, \triangleleft)$. Here we propose that this is "the most natural" for a nonclassical theory. To see this, first note that the structure $\Theta^* = (n, \triangleleft)$ is more natural than $\Theta^* = (n, \triangleright)$, for any integer $2 \leq m \leq n$.

The reason is that in the latter case, nonseparability would intervene mysteriously at an order $(m + 1)$ even though all properties are m-congruent. This would mean that nonseparability does not occur as a consequence of failure of transitivity at the preceding relational order. Thus, the "nice" connection to intransitivity of congruence would be lost.

The case for preferring $\Theta^* = (1, \triangleleft)$ over $\Theta^* = (m, \triangleleft)$ with $m \geq 2$ is that it would seem conspiratorial for the incompatibilities to be transitive up to a certain order and then fail to be so thereafter. Therefore, the most natural congruence structure is one where intransitivity of congruence enters at the simplest nontrivial level, i.e, at R_2. From this perspective, QM is a natural nonclassical theory.

Thus, in this theory, lack of JD does not have its origin in incongruence, which would be surprising and unnatural in our approach, where only the congruence structure $(1, \triangleleft)$ would be the natural choice, as it is with QM. This provides a plausible explanation for absence of OS type correlations in QM.

E. Congruence structure: a combinatorial approach

Given a relation template R, the collection of all sets, at all orders $R_2, R_3, \cdots$, constitutes the *equivalence structure* of R. Quite generally, the equivalence structure over properties α_j defines a *partial order* or *logic*. We shall be primarily interested in the *congruence structure* of a regular theory, i.e., the equivalence structure for the relation of congruence.

Where there is no confusion, we shall use the short form $\underline{\alpha\beta} \equiv R_2(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\underline{\alpha\beta\gamma} \equiv R_3(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, etc. The congruence structure of the classical theory of three fiducial observables X, Y, Z would be:



FIG. 2. Congruence structures for regular theories with 4 fiducial observables: the leftmost figure represents classical theory, which is given by a simplicial complex or hypergraph with 2-, 3- and 4-edges; second from left is the XOS theory, which only lacks the 4-edge; next is quantum theory in a CHSH-like contextual setting; the previous two involve higher-level nonclassicality, and thus absence of JD. The rightmost represents a nonclassical theory with transitive congruence, thus involving only base-level nonclassicality. A congruence structure and graph representation is related to, but distinct from, the exclusivity graph of the type considered in Refs. [19, 21, 23].

$$\mathfrak{K} = \{\underline{XYZ},\ \underline{XY},\ \underline{YZ},\ \underline{XZ},\ \underline{X},\ \underline{Y},\ \underline{Z}\}. \qquad (72)$$

Two R_2-chains here are $\{\underline{XY}, \underline{YZ}\}$ and $\{\underline{XY}, \underline{XZ}\}$, both being extendable to the R_3-relation $\underline{XYZ}$. Now set $\mathfrak{K}$ describes a *σ-algebra* and thus corresponds to Boolean logic, assuming the addition of the empty set element $\emptyset$ (Henceforth, we shall implicitly make this assumption, where required, to complete a congruence structure).

The congruence structure for Spekkens' toy model, which is a nonclassical theory where all pairs of observables are incongruent, is

$$\mathfrak{K} = \{\underline{X},\ \underline{Y},\ \underline{Z}\}, \qquad (73)$$

which obviously deviates from a σ-algebra. A similar deviation holds also for the congruence structure of a nonclassical theory characterized by *transitive* congruence. For example, in the case of four fiducial observables A, B, C, D, it is

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\underline{AB},\ \underline{CD},\ \underline{A},\ \underline{B},\ \underline{C},\ \underline{D}\}, \qquad (74)$$

where A and B are mutually congruent, but each of these is incongruent with either of C and D, both of which are congruent (cf. last picture in Figure 2). Clearly, the congruence structure of a nonclassical regular theory deviates from a σ-algebra.

However, we note that the above mentioned are simple theories and characterized by a congruence structure that is either a σ-algebra or a union of σ-algebras. Non-simple theories are characterized by a non-Boolean logic that corresponds to neither a σ-algebra nor a union of σ-algebras. A simple example is provided by four observables A, B, C, D suitable for CHSH-like contextuality tests. Here the congruence strucutre is

$$\mathfrak{K} = \{\underline{AC}, \underline{BC}, \underline{CD}, \underline{DA}, \underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{C}, \underline{D}, \emptyset\}. \qquad (75)$$

Here $\mathfrak{K}$ is intransitive in that $\underline{AC}$ is absent in $\mathfrak{K}$ despite the presence of $\underline{AB}$ and $\underline{BC}$. A non-simplete theory need

not possess an intransitive congruence structure. An example is the XOS theory where the congruence structure is unextendable, despite being transitive. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{K} = \{&\underline{ABC}, \underline{BCD}, \underline{ABD}, \underline{ACD},\\ &\underline{AB}, \underline{AC}, \underline{AD}, \underline{BC}, \underline{BD}, \underline{CD},\\ &\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{C}, \underline{D}, \emptyset\},\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

which deviates from a σ-algebra, owing to the absence of $\underline{ABCD}$ (cf. Figure 2).

VII. Σ-ONTOLOGY FOR CONTEXTUALITY

From the perspective of Σ-ontology, basic nonclassicality of a regular theory arises essentially because of the compressive action of $\varphi_\triangledown$ on the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ (the map $\varphi_\star$ adds attractive features like pure state preparability). The simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ itself has a direct product structure and is quite classical. In particular, the underlying versions of the observables are separable, meaning that any state ψ has a JD over the values of the observables. This idea forms the basis of the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$. Higher nonclassicality will be seen to correspond to the addition of a further fundamental type of nonclassicality, which occurs when the underlying simplex itself deviates from the direct product structure form, leading to quantum contextuality.

When a contextuality inequality is violated and hence no JD exists, the underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$ of the type described earlier, which assumes separable observables, does not exist. One can still envisage an underlying simplex, provided we enlarge the convex direct product suitably. We shall find that the *convex contextual product*, denoted by the symbol $\overline{\otimes}$, fulfills this requirement. Essentially, the operation $\overline{\otimes}$ is a recursive application of $\underline{\otimes}$ to combinations of observables. This will be used to define an underlying simplex, $\Sigma_\sqcup^{\theta\bullet}$, suitable for contextuality. Here θ is the "valency" of an observable, meaning the number of other observables it must combine with, to determine the full measurement context, and satisfies $0 \leq \theta \leq \Theta$. In fact, larger valencies correspond to higher-order interference than observed in a doubles-slit interferometric experiment [40]. We shall sometimes indicate the valency by a subscript to the $\overline{\otimes}$ operator.

Suppose $\theta = 1$, so that the context is specified by a single fiducial observable. Given fiducial observables $X, Y, Z, \cdots$, we define

$$\Sigma_X \,\overline{\otimes}_1\, \Sigma_Y \,\overline{\otimes}_1\, \Sigma_Z \,\overline{\otimes}_1\, \cdots \equiv \Sigma_{XY} \,\underline{\otimes}\, \Sigma_{YZ} \,\underline{\otimes}\, \Sigma_{XZ} \,\underline{\otimes}\, \cdots, \tag{77}$$

where $\Sigma_{XY} = \Sigma_X \,\underline{\otimes}\, \Sigma_Y$, and so on. For $\theta = 2$, the RHS will contain operands such as Σ_{XYZ}, meaning that the context is specified by two observables, an example of which is studied later. Here it suffices to note that, as with the convex direct product, if the convex sets being combined are simplexes, then the convex contextual product is a simplex. In general, the marginal probabilities $P_X, P_Y, P_Z, \cdots$ are not well defined, which may be averted by imposing additional backward consistency conditions. In the absence of backward consistency, the full combined space will be of the form $\Sigma_{XYZ\cdots} \,\underline{\otimes}\, \Sigma^{(1)}_{XYZ\cdots} \,\underline{\otimes}\, \Sigma^{(2)}_{XYZ\cdots} \cdots$, i.e., probabilities are explicitly specified for different valencies.

In particular, the vertices of convex set $\Sigma_\sqcup^{\theta\bullet}$ are in general classical (deterministic) contextual configurations, meaning, they correspond to a classical mechanism to reproduce contextual behavior. The underlying simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup$introduced in Section V corresponds to $\theta = 0$.

An example for a classical contextual configuration suitable to simulate the OS theory would be as follows: the properties X, Y, Z have definite values 0, 0, 1, except that if X is measured along with Y, then a hidden mechanism causes a "signal" to be transmitted from Y to X instructing X to flip its bit value. This may be represented as follows:

input	output
XY	10

$\otimes$

input	output
YZ	01

$\otimes$

input	output
ZX	10

(78)

For the OS theory, there are $4^3 = 64$ classical contextual configurations such as (78), which constitute the vertices of a 63-simplex, denoted $\Sigma_\sqcup^{1\bullet}$, or simply $\Sigma_\sqcup^\bullet$, given by:

$$\Sigma_\sqcup^\bullet = \Sigma_X \,\overline{\otimes}\, \Sigma_Y \,\overline{\otimes}\, \Sigma_Z. \tag{79}$$

Our strategy will be to use this object as the underlying simplex and impose backward consistency on the gdit space derived by application of the compression operation $\varphi_\triangledown$.

In g-type ontology, the action of $\varphi_\triangledown$ on $\Sigma_\sqcup^\bullet$ is a transformation analogous to that of going from the form of Eq. (1) to that of Eq. (5). Under this mapping, the classical contextual configuration Eq. (78) yields

input	output
XY	10

$\oplus$

input	output
YZ	01

$\oplus$

input	output
ZX	10

, (80)

which can be represented more conventionally as:

input	output
XY	10
YZ	01
ZX	10

(81)

the *contextual gdit*, since it is the gdit version of these classical deterministic configurations. Since compression $\varphi_\triangledown$ preserves the extreme points, there are 64 contextual gdits, whose convex hull is the corresponding gdit theory space $\Sigma_\sqcup^{\theta\bullet}$, the *underlying contextual gdit space*, with dimension $3 \times (4-1) = 9$ (a 7-fold reduction in dimensionality).

This contextual gdit violates the "no-signaling" conditions for single systems, more precisely, *non-contextuality of probabilities* in the sense of Gleason's theoreom [41]:

$$\begin{aligned}P(a|AB) &= P(a|AC),\\ P(b|BA) &= P(b|BC),\\ P(c|CA) &= P(c|CB),\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

where $P(a|AB)$ denotes the probability to obtain outcome a when A is measured alongside B.

It is convenient to compose the crumpling map in terms of two sub-mappings: $\varphi_\star = \varphi_\star^- \circ \varphi_\star^+$. The mapping $\varphi_\star^+ : \Sigma_\cup^\bullet \to \Sigma^+$ imposes the "contextual no-signaling" conditions (82), where Σ^+ refers to the *contextual no-signaling polytope*, i.e., the largest convex set embedded in $\Sigma_\cup^\bullet$ consistent with contextual no-signaling. Obviously, $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma^+$, and mapping $\varphi_\star^- : \Sigma^+ \to \Sigma$.

For a theory of 3-input-n-outcome systems, Eq. (82) would impose $N_G \equiv 3(n-1)$ conditions, whilst the dimension of the contextual gdit theory $\Sigma_\cup^\bullet$ underlying the OS theory would be $D_\cup^\bullet \equiv 3(n^2-1)$. Therefore, with imposition of conditions (82), the dimension of the contextual no-signaling polytope Σ^+, embedded within the gdit polytope $\Sigma_\cup^\bullet$ is, $D_\cup^\bullet - N_G = 3n(n-1)$. By tomographic separability, the nonsimplex Σ for a 3-input-n-output regular theory has dimension $3(n-1)$. Therefore the map $\varphi_\star^- : \Sigma^+ \to \Sigma$ involves a further n-fold reduction of dimensionality (for a discussion on dimensionality mismatch in a different context, cf. [42]).

Example. The following six contextual OS gdits

Input	Output					
	$\mathcal{Q}_1^A$	$\mathcal{Q}_2^A$	$\mathcal{Q}_1^B$	$\mathcal{Q}_2^B$	$\mathcal{Q}_1^C$	$\mathcal{Q}_2^C$
AB	01	10	01	10	01	10
BC	10	01	01	10	10	01
CA	01	10	10	10	10	01

, (83)

each of which violates the OS inequality (69), by reaching the algebraic minimum of -3. In Eq. (83), the first column is the pair of joint inputs, and each other column is the output corresponding to a given deterministic contextual box $\mathcal{Q}_j^k$. Here the box $\mathcal{Q}_2^A$ is just the gdit represented in Eq. (81). The superscript corresponds to the observable for which a Kochen-Specker contradiction would arise in a realistic assignment of values.

The vertices of the contextual no-signaling polytope Σ^+ derived from the above contextual gdit polytope has vertices formed by equally mixing a gdit like $\mathcal{Q}_1^j$ and its "partner" gdit $\mathcal{Q}_2^j$, where the latter is obtained from the former by flipping the outcome bits, and $j \in \{A, B, C\}$. For the contextual gdits in (83), we obtain the three nonsignaling *contextual boxes* $\mathcal{Q}^j \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{Q}_1^j + \mathcal{Q}_2^j\right)$, which violate Eq. (69) by reaching its algebraic minimum, but respect the Gleason no-signaling conditions (82).

Any state in the polytope generated by these contextual no-signaling boxes $\mathcal{Q}^j$ has uncertainty $\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2}$ as per (24), where the uncertainty arises from the underlying mixing. We observe that the no-signaling feature is essentially equivalent to backward consistency. Therefore, any such state in Σ^+ is backward consistent, in contrast to states in $\Sigma_\cup^\bullet - \Sigma^+$, in particular, the contextual gdits $\mathcal{Q}_k^j$. The $\mathcal{Q}^j$'s are the contextuality analogues of the PR boxes [43, 44], which violate the CHSH inequality for quantum nonlocality to its algebraic maximum. ∎

As in the case of OS theory, the underlying contextual simplex $\Sigma_\sqcup^{2\bullet}$ for the XOS theory can be constructed with vertices given by classical signaling configurations. Under the map $\varphi_\triangledown$, these configurations transform to XOS contextual gdits, which are the vertices of the underlying contextual gdit polytope, $\Sigma_\cup^{2\bullet}$. Three such contextual gdits, which are the XOS equivalents of (83), are:

Input	Output		
	$\mathcal{R}_1$	$\mathcal{R}_2$	$\mathcal{R}_3$
XYZ	012	120	201
YZW	120	201	012
ZWX	201	012	120
WXY	012	120	201

, (84)

each of which violates the XOS contextuality inequality (70) to its algebraic maximum of 4. As in the OS case, each contextual XOS gdit $\mathcal{R}_j$ violates contextual no-signaling.

Under the crumpling map $\varphi_\star^+ : \Sigma_\sqcup^{2\bullet} \to \Sigma^+$ we obtain the contextual no-signaling polytope Σ^+ appropriate to the XOS toy theory, whose vertices include contextual boxes, one of which is obtained by taking a uniform average $\frac{1}{3}(\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3)$.

VIII. SIMULATION AND MEASUREMENT CONTEXTUALITY

Each of the contextual boxes and contextual gdits is characterized by a *contextuality cost* C, which is the minimum extra bit(s) of context information that must be transferred on average from one property to another in order to simulate the behavior of a contextual probability distribution using classical or more general resources. Cost C is the contextuality equivalent of communication cost [45, 46] that appears in the discussion on nonlocality.

For example, consider the simulation of OS correlations. Consider the contextual box $\mathcal{Q}^A$ obtained by mixing the first two contextual gdits in Eq. (83). To simulate $\mathcal{Q}^A$ classically, one can use a uniform mixture of noncontextual deterministic pre-shared value assignments $ABC \to \{010, 101\}$. These suffice if measurements AB or BC are chosen. However, since the measurements are freely chosen, one cannot rule out beforehand the choice of AC. An additional 1-bit context specification is needed that determines whether A is co-measured with C or not. A similar argument holds for the other OS contextual boxes $\mathcal{Q}^k$ derived from Eq. (83). Thus, to simulate OS theory, if the pre-shared resource is deterministic, then a 1-bit "context signal" or context specification is required by way augmenting the simulation resource. On the other hand, if the resources are contextual boxes $\mathcal{Q}^j$, then by construction, no contextual signaling is present in the resource, but there is indeterminism (due to the underlying mixing). This idea can be generalized as follows.

We can form "unbalanced" contextual boxes from unequal mixtures $\mathcal{Q}^j(p) \equiv p\mathcal{Q}_1^j + (1-p)\mathcal{Q}_2^j$, where $j \in \{A, B, C\}, 0 \leq p \leq 1$. Given a simulation resource, the contextual signal S_G can be quantified as follows. Let

$$s_A \equiv \max_a |P(a|AB) - P(a|AC)|\,, \tag{85}$$

where a can be set to 0 or 1. We let $S_G \equiv \max\{s_A, s_B, s_C\}$, where s_B and s_c are defined analogously to Eq. (85). We define intrinsic randomness under measurement of A to be:

$$I \equiv \max_{\xi=B,C} \min_a P(a|A\xi). \tag{86}$$

It can be shown, in the manner of [45], that any mixture of the deterministic boxes in (69) satisfies the trade-off relation:

$$S_G + 2I \geq 1. \tag{87}$$

If $I = 0$, then $S_G = 1$, which corresponds to deterministic pre-shared randomness. On the other hand, if $S_G = 0$, then $I = \frac{1}{2}$, which corresponds to a $\mathcal{Q}^j$ resource. This result is analogous to the trade-off between signaling and local randomness in the spatial context, studied by various authors [45, 47, 48].

IX. CRYPTOGRAPHY

Since incongruence entails measurement disturbance and no-cloning, it also guarantees unconditional cryptographic security. However, this security is not device-independent. If we relax the transitivity of congruence, then a certain flavor of device independence can be obtained. To demonstrate the two forms of security, we define the task of *local key distribution* (LKD), which is simply the local analogue of the conventional key distribution task.

A. Unconditional security

LKD works as follows. Alice and Bob alone have two copies of the key to a strongbox. Alice opens the box and leaves a random bit $\kappa \in \{0, 1\}$ for Bob to read, and then locks the box. Bob comes along later, open the box with his key, and receives his message.

In the real world, a classical implementation of LKD is not unconditionally secure, since classical laws do not preclude that an eavesdropper can break open the box, read the secret bit κ and then rebuild the box, without Alice and Bob knowing about it.

Now consider the following protocol implemented in the nonclassical but noncontextual theory given by (7). It is the LKD version of the Bennett-Brassard 1984 (BB84) quantum key distribution (QKD) protocol [49]:

BB84 LKD. (a) Alice randomly prepares n particles in one of the four states $|\psi_X^\kappa\rangle, |\psi_Z^\kappa\rangle$ given by (7) by measuring X or Z on each particle. She leaves them at a pre-agreed location; (b) Later, Bob arrives at the location and measures the particles randomly in the basis X or Z. He notes the outcomes τ. (c) On the key string so extracted, Alice and Bob publicly discuss to retain only those outcomes where their bases agree; this forms their raw key string; (d) They agree on certain coordinates and announce the outcomes on those coordinates. If too many of them are mismatched, they deem the protocol round secure and abort the round. (d) Else Alice and Bob proceed to classically extract a secure, smaller key from the remaining bits. ∎

Security comes from the fact that although Eve can deterministically extract the encoded bit by measuring if she measures in the right basis, she will produce measurement disturbance if she gets the basis wrong, which can be detected in step (c).

Suppose Eve implements such an intercept-resend attack, by measuring X or Z on m gbits from a total of n particles transmitted. She extracts $I(A{:}E) = \frac{m}{2}$ bits of information on average. Let $f \equiv \frac{m}{n}$. On average, Alice and Bob will check the basis not used by Eve half the times, and half of these times, they obtain the answer not encoded by Alice. On the remaining fraction, their measured outcome is consistent with Alice's encoded value. Thus, the error observed by Alice and Bob is $e = \frac{f}{4}$, so that on average Bob receives $I(A:B) = \left(1 - h\left[\frac{f}{4}\right]\right)$ bits of information per transmitted gbit.

The protocol can be shown to be secure if $I(A:B) \geq I(A:E)$ [50], which in this case becomes

$$\left(1 - h\left[\frac{f}{4}\right]\right) \geq \frac{f}{2} \tag{88}$$

or $f \approx 0.68$, so that the tolerable error rate $e_{\max} = 0.48/4 = 17\%$. The probability that Eve is not detected on an attacked particle is $\frac{3}{4}$. Therefore the probability that she escapes detection on all the m bits she attacks is $(3/4)^m$, which falls exponentially with security parameter m. This exponential drop characterizes *unconditional* security.

But the security is not *device independent* (cf. [51], and references therein). Alice and Bob implicitly assume in the BB84 LKD protocol that the preparation and measurement devices are trustworthy. Now suppose that the device has been manufactured by Eve such that each actual particle is replaced by a clandestine random 2-bit preparation, such that when Alice measures X, the pre-existing bit is presented, and similarly for if she measures Z. If (subsequently) Bob measures the same observable, he obtains the same bit as Alice, else an uncorrelated bit. This reproduces the BB84 statistics. It is entirely insecure once Eve learns about their respective bases during their public discussion. This is just the higher-dimension attack [52] adapted from BB84 to the present protocol.

Thus, BB84 LKD is not secure in the device independent scenario.

B. Partial device independent security

Now we consider a nonclassical theory with nontrivial congruence structure, characterized by five observables V, W, X, Y, Z and the cyclic R_2-chain: $R_2(V,W), R_2(W,X), R_2(X,Y), R_2(Y,Z), R_2(Z,V)$, and every other pair being incongruent. By the assumption of tomographic separability, an arbitrary state is assumed to be completely specified by the five fiducial probabilities P_V, P_W, P_X, P_Y and P_Z, which in turn determine $P_{VW}, P_{WX}, P_{XY}, P_{YZ}$ and P_{ZV}, assumed to be consistent with contextual no-signaling. We shall refer to this theory (fragment) as $\mathcal{T}_{\rm KCBS}$, in view of the work where the contextuality of such correlations was studied [53].

Consider a state ρ in this contextual theory, where all the above pairs produce perfectly random but anticorrelated outcomes, i.e., 01 or 10. We can check directly that there is no way to assign values 0 and 1 to these five observables (indeed, any odd number of observables) in such a way as to satisfy this requirement, because there would be a clash of values on at least one observable. That is, if A has value a, then B has $\overline{a}$, C has a, D has $\overline{a}$ so that E has a requiring A to have $\overline{a}$, contrary to assumption. Thus, ρ does not correspond to a state that has a JD over the five variables, where they take definite values. This is witnessed by the violation of the KCBS inequality

$$\langle VW\rangle + \langle WX\rangle + \langle XY\rangle + \langle YZ\rangle + \langle ZA\rangle \geq -3, \quad (89)$$

where $V, W, X, Y, Z = \pm 1$ [53].

Now consider the following protocol implemented in $\mathcal{T}_{\rm KCBS}$:

KCBS LKD. (a) Alice prepares n particles in state ρ, which she leaves at a pre-agreed location, *after* measuring each using one of the five observables V, W, X, Y, Z; (b) Later Bob arrives at the location and measures the particles randomly in any one of these five bases. (c) Alice and Bob announce their measurement bases and throw away the (approximately 40%) data corresponding to instances where their bases aren't either identical or juxtaposted; (d) They publicly agree on certain coordinates of particles, and disclose their measurement outcomes for these. If their selected bases are identical (resp., juxtaposed), they verify that the outcomes are random and identical (resp., anti-correlated). If too many of them fail this criterion, then they abort the protocol. (e) Else Alice and Bob proceed to classically distil a secure, smaller key from the remaining bits. ∎

In this case note that no pre-existing record can reproduce the KCBS perfect correlations. Thus, any *passive* cheat device of the type mentioned above will fail to pass the KCBS test, giving a kind of device independence. Note that an *active* cheat device, meaning one that allows memory to be carried forward in time (which is a kind of local signaling), can defeat the protocol. For example, the device produces an arbitrary output when Alice measures. Her basis and outcome information are retained in the system's memory, so that if Bob measures in the basis as she did, then the device produces the identical (resp., anticorrelated) outcome if his basis matches (resp., is juxtaposted to) hers, and a random outcome otherwise.

Thus, contextuality can provide security to LKD in the restricted device-independent scenario where memorylessness (with regard to Alice's input) is assumed, but a nonclassical theory without contextuality lacks security even in this memoryless device-independent scenario. Note that in the case where device independence is based on nonlocality, the memory of Alice's actions (and outcomes) cannot be transmitted in light-travel time to Bob's spacelike separated measurment event, thereby preventing Eve from launching the above kind of attack. In fact, without assumptions about device trustworthiness, that would be the only way to prevent Eve's device attack. Thus, full device independence requires nonlocality, and contextuality will be insufficient.

X. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we were motivated to investigate the origin of nonclassicality in finite-dimensional monopartite systems in the convex framework. We identified two axioms that capture a host of nonclassical features: (a) Pairwise *incongruence* among m ($m > 2$) observables, with the geometric consequence of non-simpliciality of the state space; (b) Prohibition of m-congruence associated with an intransitive congruence structure.

The first axiom guarantees many nonclassical features such as multiple pure-state decompositions, measurement disturbance, no-cloning, impossibility to jointly distinguish all pure states, unconditional but not device-independent cryptographic security, uncertainty (effectively), preparation contextuality and the lack of certain universal operations, the last two with some ontological considerations. Axiom (a), which we identify with the base-level nonclassicality, does not allow us to derive Kochen-Specker (KS) contextuality, for which axiom (b), corresponding to the higher-level nonclassicality, is needed.

Our approach has the conceptual ramification of elucidating that features like joint measurability, uncertainty, no-cloning or preparation contextuality do not fully capture the richness of the nonclassicality of quantum mechanical single systems, since these concepts correspond only to axiom (a). A theory that satisfies axiom (a) but not (b) would be nonclassical in the basic sense of possessing a no-cloning theorem etc., but will lack KS contextuality. An example of such a theory is Spekkens toy theory [25].

In this toy theory, a single system has three observables

("questions"). All equal mixtures of maximal knowledge states of the three observables are operationally indistinguishable, meaning that the state space is non-simplicial, though in that work it is not described geometrically but instead as a manifestation of the "knowledge-balance" principle. On the other hand, all of three observables are pairwise incongruent, so that the possibility of intransitivity of pairwise congruence does not arise. Therefore, the toy theory admits our axiom (a) but not axiom (b). Our result thus explains why the theory reproduces many nonclassical features, but not KS contextuality. Therefore, in response to Spekkens' open question [25, Section IX], as to what other principle, besides the knowledge-balance principle, is required to capture the remaining quantum phenomena, our approach suggests one such candidate: namely, the intransitivity or unextendability of pairwise congruence, i.e., axiom (b).

Here we only consider single systems, without reference to correlated systems, in contrast to various current foundational studies. Thus, in the absence of other assumptions, all nonclassical features derived in our study are logically independent of whether or not the theory in question is nonlocal or nonsignaling.

By identifying nonclassical features that are logically related and those that are logically independent in any regular theory, our approach would be important for axiomatic reconstructions of QM [18, 54–58]. A recent set of works [19–22] have studied general principles to derive the exact quantum mechanical bound on contextuality. Our work here can be considered as complementing this line of research by linking base-level nonclassical features like no-cloning, non-comeasurability, etc. with contextuality, and could potentially shed light on the particular form of a principle use to quantify the bound on quantum contextuality.

Our work has an strong connection to another axiomatic direction. Although contextuality and nonlocality are closely connected, most works linking nonlocality with the features of single systems [2, 11–16] have been concerned with only what we have called base-level nonclassical features of the single system like no-cloning, intrinsic randomness, complementarity and measurement uncertainty, rather than with contextuality. By connecting base-level monopartite features like no-cloning, non-comeasurability with contextuality, our work offers a new direction to complete the link between nonlocality and contextuality in relation to the above works.

In QM, all these nonclassical features are tied closely together by the single theme of noncommutative algebra, making it difficult to discern basic interdependence from independence. Our approach shows, for instance, that a purported (say) information theoretic axiom that allows the derivation of a nonclassical theory $\mathcal{T}$ with a no-cloning theorem is also expected to lead to measurement uncertainty and measurement disturbance. Thus, these latter features do not require any "further explanation". On the other hand, if theory $\mathcal{T}$ is contextual, then one may seek grounds for the inclusion of axiom (b) in $\mathcal{T}$.

Finally, we believe that the explanatory value of an axiomatic approach is enhanced by the choice of axioms that appear "natural" and that are naturally connected with each other. Thus, once one isolates the most elementary surprise about a theory and identifies it as the basic axiom, this should lead us smoothly to the other axiom(s). In our work, pairwise measurement incongruence serves– it may be hoped– as such a basic axiom for QM, which then naturally leads to the question of (in)congruence among multiple properties, leading to the second axiom.

The requirement of naturalness of axioms is not entirely aesthetic, but based on our belief that fulfilling it would position us in the state of "the right ignorance" that would guide us to the right questions answering which would enable us to understand why QM has this particular mathematical structure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SA acknowledges support through the INSPIRE fellowship [IF120025] by the Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India and Manipal university graduate programme. AP thanks Defense Research & Development Organization (DRDO), India for the support provided through the project number ERIP/ER/1403163/M/01/1603.

[1] J. Bell, "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox," Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[2] Ll. Masanes, A. Acin, and N. Gisin, "General properties of nonsignaling theories," Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012112 (2006).
[3] Jonathan Barrett, "Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories," Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032304 (2007).
[4] Jonathan Barrett, Noah Linden, Serge Massar, Stefano Pironio, Sandu Popescu, and David Roberts, "Nonlocal correlations as an information-theoretic resource," Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022101 (2005).
[5] Gilles Brassard, Harry Buhrman, Noah Linden, André Allan Méthot, Alain Tapp, and Falk Unger, "Limit on nonlocality in any world in which communication complexity is not trivial," Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 250401 (2006).
[6] Anne Broadbent and Andr Allan Mthot, "On the power of non-local boxes," Theoretical Computer Science **358**, 3 – 14 (2006).
[7] Howard Barnum, Jonathan Barrett, Matthew Leifer, and Alexander Wilce, "Generalized no-broadcasting theorem," Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 240501 (2007).

[8] Howard Barnum, "Quantum information processing, operational quantum logic, convexity, and the foundations of physics," Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics **34**, 343 – 379 (2003), quantum Information and Computation.

[9] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro D'Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti, "Probabilistic theories with purification," Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062348 (2010).

[10] Peter Janotta and Haye Hinrichsen, "Generalized probability theories: what determines the structure of quantum theory?" Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **47**, 323001 (2014).

[11] Manik Banik, Md. Rajjak Gazi, Sibasish Ghosh, and Guruprasad Kar, "Degree of complementarity determines the nonlocality in quantum mechanics," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 052125 (2013); M. Banik, "Measurement incompatibility and Schrodinger-EPR steering in a class of probabilistic theories," J. Math. Phys. **56**, 052101 (2015).

[12] Wonmin Son, Erika Andersson, Stephen M. Barnett, and M. S. Kim, "Joint measurements and Bell inequalities," Phys. Rev. A **72**, 052116 (2005).

[13] Michael M. Wolf, David Perez-Garcia, and Carlos Fernandez, "Measurements incompatible in quantum theory cannot be measured jointly in any other no-signaling theory," Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 230402 (2009).

[14] Marco Túlio Quintino, Tamás Vértesi, and Nicolas Brunner, "Joint measurability, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering, and Bell nonlocality," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 160402 (2014).

[15] Neil Stevens and Paul Busch, "Steering, incompatibility, and Bell-inequality violations in a class of probabilistic theories," Phys. Rev. A **89**, 022123 (2014).

[16] Jonathan Oppenheim and Stephanie Wehner, "The uncertainty principle determines the nonlocality of quantum mechanics," Science **330**, 1072–1074 (2010).

[17] H. Barnum, S. Beigi, S. Boixo, M. B. Elliott, and S. Wehner, "Local quantum measurement and no-signaling imply quantum correlations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 140401 (2010).

[18] H. Barnum, M. P. Mller, and C. Ududec, "Higher-order interference and single-system postulates characterizing quantum theory," NJP **16**, 123029 (2014).

[19] Adán Cabello, "Simple explanation of the quantum violation of a fundamental inequality," Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 060402 (2013).

[20] Antonio Acín, Tobias Fritz, Anthony Leverrier, and Ana Belén Sainz, "A combinatorial approach to nonlocality and contextuality," Communications in Mathematical Physics **334**, 533–628 (2015).

[21] J. Henson, "Quantum contextuality from a simple principle?" (2012), arxiv.org/abs/1210.5978.

[22] Joe Henson, "Bounding quantum contextuality with lack of third-order interference," Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 220403 (2015).

[23] Adán Cabello, Simone Severini, and Andreas Winter, "Graph-theoretic approach to quantum correlations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 040401 (2014).

[24] S. Kochen and E.P. Specker, "On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967).

[25] Robert W. Spekkens, "Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory," Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032110 (2007).

[26] Paweł Kurzyński, Adán Cabello, and Dagomir Kaszlikowski, "Fundamental monogamy relation between contextuality and nonlocality," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 100401 (2014).

[27] E. G. Beltrametti and S. Bugajski, "Decomposability of mixed states into pure states and related properties," Int. J. Th. Phys. **32**, 2235 (1993).

[28] L. Hardy, "Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms," (2001), quant-ph/0101012.

[29] Lucin Hardy, "Probability theories in general and quantum theory in particular," Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics **34**, 381 – 393 (2003), quantum Information and Computation.

[30] P. Mana, "Why can states and measurement outcomes be represented as vectors?" (2003), quant-ph/0305117.

[31] R. W. Spekkens, "Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements," Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052108 (2005).

[32] Howard Barnum and Alexander Wilce, "Information processing in convex operational theories," Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science **270**, 3 – 15 (2011), proceedings of the Joint 5th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic and 4th Workshop on Developments in Computational Models (QPL/DCM 2008).

[33] "Generalized barycentric coordinates," Wikipedia, (2016).

[34] P. Busch, T. Heinosaari, J. Schultz, and N. Stevens, "Comparing the degrees of incompatibility inherent in probabilistic physical theories," EPL **103**, 10002 (2013).

[35] N. Kumar and R. Srikanth, "Bosonic stimulation as a natural realization of the polya urn problem," Phys. Lett. A **359**, 281 (2006).

[36] R. E. Tarjan, (2009), online course for Probability & Computing, Princeton Univ.

[37] O. Dahlsten, A. J. P. Garner, and V. Vedral, "How uncertainty enables non-classical dynamics," Nat. Commun. **5**, 4592 (2014).

[38] Pranaw Rungta, V. Bužek, Carlton M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, "Universal state inversion and concurrence in arbitrary dimensions," Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001).

[39] Yeong-Cherng Liang, Robert W. Spekkens, and Howard M. Wiseman, "Specker's parable of the overprotective seer: A road to contextuality, nonlocality and complementarity," Physics Reports **506**, 1–39 (2011).

[40] R. Sorkin, "Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory," Mod. Phys. Lett. **A9**, 3119 (1994).

[41] A. M. Gleason, "Measures on the closed subspaces of a hilbert space," J. Math. Mech. **6**, 885 (1957).

[42] N. Brunner, M. Kaplan, A. Leverrier, and P. Skrzypczyk, "Dimension of physical systems, information processing, and thermodynamics," New J. Phys. **16**, 123050 (2014).

[43] V. Scarani, "Feats, features and failures of the PR-box," in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 844 (Melville, NY, 2006) pp. 309–320.

[44] Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich, "Quantum nonlocality as an axiom," Found. Phys. **24**, 379–385 (1994).

[45] S. Aravinda and R. Srikanth, "Complementarity between signalling and local indeterminacy in quantum nonlocal correlations," Quant. Inf. Comp. **15**, 308–315 (2015).

[46] S. Pironio, "Violations of Bell inequalities as lower bounds on the communication cost of nonlocal correlations," Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062102 (2003).

[47] G. Kar, MD. R. Gazi, M. Banik, S. Das, A. Rai, and S. Kunkri, "A complementary relation between classical bits and randomness in local part in the simulating singlet state," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **44**, 152002 (2011).
[48] M. J. W. Hall, "Complementary contributions of indeterminism and signaling to quantum correlations," Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062117 (2010).
[49] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, "Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore* (1984) p. 175.
[50] I. Csizár and J. Körner, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **24**, 339 (1978).
[51] Umesh Vazirani and Thomas Vidick, "Fully device-independent quantum key distribution," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140501 (2014).
[52] Jonathan Barrett, Lucien Hardy, and Adrian Kent, "No signaling and quantum key distribution," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005).
[53] Alexander A. Klyachko, M. Ali Can, Sinem Binicioglu, and Alexander S. Shumovsky, "Simple test for hidden variables in spin-1 systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 020403 (2008).
[54] Christopher A. Fuchs, "Quantum mechanics as quantum information, mostly," Journal of Modern Optics **50**, 987–1023 (2003).
[55] Rob Clifton, Jeffrey Bub, and Hans Halvorson, "Characterizing quantum theory in terms of information-theoretic constraints," Foundations of Physics **33**, 1561–1591 (2003).
[56] Giacomo Mauro D'Ariano, "On the missing axiom of quantum mechanicss," AIP Conference Proceedings **810**, 114–130 (2006); "How to derive the Hilbertspace formulation of quantum mechanics from purely operational axioms," AIP Conference Proceedings **844**, 101–128 (2006); "Operational axioms for quantum mechanics," AIP Conference Proceedings **889**, 79–105 (2007); Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro D'Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti, "Informational derivation of quantum theory," Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012311 (2011); Giacomo M. D'Ariano and Paolo Perinotti, "Quantum theory is an information theory," Foundations of Physics **46**, 269–281 (2015).
[57] Llus Masanes and Markus P Mller, "A derivation of quantum theory from physical requirements," New Journal of Physics **13**, 063001 (2011).
[58] B. Dakic and C. Brukner, "Quantum theory and beyond: Is entanglement special?" in *Deep Beauty - Understanding the Quantum World through Mathematical Innovation*, edited by H. Halvorson (Cambridge University Press, 2011) pp. 365–392.

Appendix A: Nonsimpliciality and noncomeasurability

In Section III A), non-comeasurability of two observables ($m = 2$) was shown to be equivalent to nonsimplicality for regular theories. Here we consider the case $m \geq 2$. Again, without loss of generality, consider the eigenstate corresponding to the value $x_1 = 1$ of the first observable. The joint observable is represented as a set of $|\partial\Sigma|$ n^m-tensors (generalizing the n^2-tensors, i.e., matrices, of the previous case), whose entries for any given fixed pure state ψ are denoted $M(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m) \equiv M(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m|\psi)$, where $x_j \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. These entries are subject to the n marginalization conditions for each of the m observables:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(1, J) &= 1\\ &\vdots\\ \sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(n, J) &= 0,\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

and further

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(1_2, J) &= p_{21}\\ &\vdots\\ \sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(n_2, J) &= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} p_{2j}\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

and so on through other fiducial observables, until finally

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(1_d, J) &= p_{d1}\\ &\vdots\\ \sum_{J=1}^{n^{m-1}} M(n_n, J) &= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} p_{dj}.\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Here the notation (r_s, J) indicates an array of m n-qudits, where the sth qudit takes the value $r \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, while the remaining $(m-1)$ qudits take the value J.

There are m equation blocks of the type (A1), (A2) or (A3), each with n equations. In the first block, only the first line, containing n^{m-1} terms $M(x_1, \cdots, x_m)$, is nonvanishing. Thus, subject to normalization, the number of free terms are:

$$\nu_{\text{free}} = n^{m-1} - 1. \tag{A4}$$

The remaining $m-1$ blocks each have a normalization constraint, making the number of independent constraints to be:

$$\chi = (m-1)(n-1). \tag{A5}$$

It is observed that for $m = 2$, $\nu_{\text{free}} = \chi$, which was derived in the proof of Theorem 1.

If $m = 3$, then $\nu_{\text{free}} = \chi$ for $n = 2$ and $\nu_{\text{free}} > \chi$ for $n > 2$. If $m > 3$, then $\nu_{\text{free}} > \chi$ quite generally.

What this means is that if we restrict to nonclassicality arising from incongruence and thereby nonsimpliciality alone, then joint measurability of three or more observables is not prohibited. However, such a conclusion ignores the question of whether or not congruence is transitive. As we shall find, intransitivity here will serve as the source of higher order non-comeasurability.